20 NOVEMBER 1947

INDEX

Of

WITNESSES

Defense' Witnesses	Page
SHIDEHARA, Kijuro	33547
Direct by Mr. Brooks	33565
NOON RECESS	33580
Cross by Mr. Comyns Carr	33589
Redirect by Mr. Brooks	33658

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

Doc.	Def.	Pros.	Description	For In Ident.Evidenc
1964	3479-A		Affidavit of SHIDEHA Kijuro	33548
1767A(5)		3479-В	Telegram from Consul General HAYASHI to Foreign Minister SHIDEHARA, dated September 1931	0
1767A(6)		3479-C	Telegram from Consul General HAYASHI t SHIDEHARA, dated 28 September 1931	50
1767A(7)		3479-D	Telegram from Consul General to SHIDER dated 3 October 1	IARA,
1767A(8)		3479-Е	Telegram from Consul General HAYASHI t SHIDEHARA, dated October 1931	0
1767A(9)		3479 - F	Telegram from Consul General HAYASHI t SHIDEHARA, dated October 1931	0
1767A(10)	3479-G	Telegram from Consul General HAYASHI t SHIDEHARA, dated October 1931	0
1767A(17))	3479-Н	Telegram from Consul General HAYASHI t SHIDEHARA, dated October 1931	0
1767A(12)	3479 - J	Telegram from Consul General HAYASHI t SHIDEHARA, dated November 1931	0

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

(cont'd)

Doc.	Def. No.	Pros.	Description	For Ident.	In Evidence
1767A(11)	11)	3479-I	Telegram from Cor General HAYASHI SHIDEHARA, date October 1931	to	33625 33627
		AFTI	ERNOON RECESS		33626

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

(cont'd)

Doc.	Def. No.	Pros.	Description	For Ident.	In Evidence
1767A(11	.)	3479-I	Telegram from Con- General HAYASHI SHIDEHARA, date October 1931	to	33625 33627
		AFTI	ERNOON RECESS		33626

20 NOVEMBER 1947

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

(cont'd)

Doc.	Def. No.	Pros.	Description	For Ident.	In Evidence
1767A(11)	3479-I	Telegram from Cons General HAYASHI SHIDEHARA, dated October 1931	to	33625 33627	
		AFTI	ERNOON RECESS		33626

Thursday, 20 November 1947 1 2 3 INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL 4 FOR THE FAR EAST Court House of the Tribunal War Ministry Building 5 Tokyo, Japan 6 7 The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, 8 at 0930. 10 Appearances: 11 For the Tribunal, all Members sitting with 12 the exception of: HONORABLE JUSTICE SIR WILLIAM F. 13 WEBB, Member from the Commonwealth of Australia and 14 HONORABLE JUSTICE R. B. PAL, Member from India, not 15 sitting from 0930 to 1600; HONORABLE JUSTICE HENRI 16 BERNARD, Member from the Republic of France, not sitting 17 from 1330 to 1430. 18 For the Prosecution Section, same as before. 19 For the Defense Section, same as before. 20 21 (English to Japanese and Japanese 22 to English interpretation was made by the 23 Language Section, IMTFE.) 24 25

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International

Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

ACTING PRESIDENT: All the accused are

present except MATSUI and SHIRATORI who are represented by counsel. We have certificates from the

prison surgeon at Sugamo certifying that they are ill

and unable to attend the trial today. The certificates

will be recorded and filed.

With the Tribunal's permission the accused 10 TOGO will be absent from the courtroom the whole of the morning session conferring with his counsel.

Will the Clark pass out the exhibit and the

Will the Clerk pass out the exhibit and then we will proceed with the reading of the report of the Commissioner.

16 this exhibit been now received into evidence or just
17 marked for identification to be read into evidence
18 subject to objections? Why I ask that is because if
19 it is marked for identification and being read into
20 evidence subject to objections then objections are
21 proper; but if it is received into evidence, I could
22 not object to parts being offered because it would
23 not object to parts being offered because it would
24 already be in evidence. It would be improper.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Under the ruling yesterday it was admitted in evidence subject to objections at

the proper time by counsel, and whatever objections are upheld will be stricken from the record.

MR. BROOKS: Thank you, your Honor; I just wanted to understand the procedure I was to follow.

ACTING PRESIDENT: I understand that the report of the Commissioner was served on the Judges but I have not received a copy. The Clerk has no extra copy.

Will you proceed?

CLERK OF THE COURT: Language Section, do you have a copy of the covering order for simultaneous translation?

(Reading): "International Military Tribunal for the Far East -- The United States of America, et al. vs. ARAKI, Sadao, et al. -- No. 1.

"Report of the Honorable Mr. Justice
Northcroft (Member for New Zealand), Commissioner
Appointed to Take Evidence of Witness, SHIDEHARA,
Kijuro.

"WHEREAS, on the 10th day of November 1947 the Tribunal ordered that the evidence of SHIDEHARA, Kijuro, a witness whose testimony was sought by Counsel for the defendants in this trial and who on account of illness was unable to attend before the Tribunal, should be taken upon commission before me,

AND WHEREAS on Tuesday, the 11th day of November 1947, the witness SHIDEHARA, Kijuro appeared before me at his residence in the City of Tokyo and (I being satisfied that the witness was in possession of his mental faculties and fit to give evidence) his evidence was duly heard and taken, AND WHEREAS Messrs. Brooks, Alfred W.; Furness, George A, and OKAMOTO, Toshio, of Counsel for the Defense, and Mr. Comyns Carr, A.; Colonel Woolworth, G. S.; and Mr. Liu, T.C. of Counsel 10 for the Prosecution, were present at the hearing, 11 AND WHEREAS the witness, with the approval of all 12 Counsel present and himself consenting, testified in 13 English, and was cross-examined and reexamined by Counsel on behalf of the Prosecution and the Defense; 15 AND WHEREAS a Court Reporter and a Language Arbiter 16 were present throughout the hearing; 17

NOW THERE FORE, I, E. H. NORTHCROFT, Member of the International Military Tribunal for the Far East, HEREBY REPORT to the Tribunal that the evidence of the witness SHIDEHARA, Kijuro has been duly taken on commission before me in accordance with the order of the Tribunal of 10th November 1947, and I HEREBY 24 CERTIFY that the transcript of proceedings attached 25 hereto, comprising 70 pages numbered successively 1 to 70, signed by me, is a true, correct and complete

18

19

21

record of the proceedings of the Commission, that the document also attached hereto and marked with the letter 'A' is the affidavit of the said witness tendered as an exhibit in the course of the said proceedings, that the documents further attached hereto and marked successively with the letters 'B,' 'C, ''D, ''E, ''F, ''G, ''H, ''I, ' and 'J' are further exhibits tendered and received in evidence

"Dated at Tokyo, Japan, this 17th day of November 1947.

"(Signed) E. H. NORTHCROFT."

in the course of the said proceedings.

MR. BROOKS: If your Honor please, that last statement that certain letters, B, C, et cetera, down to J, are "exhibits tendered and received in evidence," I ask that that be amended to show subject, of course, to objections. Every one of those was objected to.

ACTING PRESIDENT: That ruling has already been announced. There is no need for any more argument on it.

Will the Clerk proceed to read the order appointing the Commissioner, pages 3 and 4?

CLERK OF THE COURT (Reading): "Case No. 1 The United States of America, et al. vs. ARAKI, Sadao,

10

11

13

15

17

19

21

22

23

24

et al.

"Commission to Take the Deposition of SHIDEHARA, Kijuro.

"The Defense having offered in evidence the affidavit of SHIDEHARA, Kijuro, together with verified certificate executed by HIROTOSHI, Hashimoto, attending physician, certifying that the said SHIDEHARA is ill and unable to attend this trial and give his testimony in person and, the Prosecution objecting to the giving in evidence of the testimony of the said SHIDEHARA without opportunity to cross-examine him at this time, it also appearing that the said SHIDEHARA resides in the suburbs of Tokyo, it is, therefore, duly considered by this Tribunal that the evidence of the said SHIDEHARA should be taken by deposition before one of the Members of this Tribunal as Commissioner, and it is

"ORDERED: That the deposition of the witness SHIDEHARA, Kijuro be taken before the Honorable Mr. Justice Northcroft, a Member of this Tribunal, as Commissioner so to do, at the residence of the said SHIDEHARA, Kijuro on the 11th day of November, 1947 at the hour of 2:00 p.m. or as soon thereafter as the said Commissioner may determine, and from day to day and hour to hour thereafter until completed, and the

et al.

"Commission to Take the Deposition of SHIDEHARA, Kijuro.

"The Defense having offered in evidence the affidavit of SHIDEHARA, Kijuro, together with verified certificate executed by HIROTOSHI, Hashimoto, attending physician, certifying that the said SHIDEHARA is ill and unable to attend this trial and give his testimony in person and, the Prosecution objecting to the giving in evidence of the testimony of the said SHIDEMARA without opportunity to cross-examine him at this time, it also appearing that the said SHIDEMARA resides in the suburbs of Tokyo, it is, therefore, duly considered by this Tribunal that the evidence of the said SHIDEMARA should be taken by deposition before one of the Members of this Tribunal as Commissioner, and it is

"ORDERED: That the deposition of the witness SHIDEHARA, Kijuro be taken before the Honorable Mr. Justice Northcroft, a Member of this Tribunal, as Commissioner so to do, at the residence of the said SHIDEHARA, Kijuro on the 11th day of November, 1947 at the hour of 2:00 p.m. or as soon thereafter as the said Commissioner may determine, and from day to day and hour to hour thereafter until completed, and the

Honorable Mr. Justice Northcroft is hereby designated and appointed as Commissioner before whom said deposition shall be taken; that a sufficient number of court reporters of this Tribunal, with the assistance of interpreters of this Tribunal, shall record the testimony given and that said deposition, when taken, transcribed and translated, shall be filed with the Secretariat of this Tribunal;

"Further, that the Secretariat of this Tribunal is directed to make the necessary arrangements for the taking of this deposition.

"Dated this 10th day of November, 1947 at Tokyo, Japan.

"FOR THE TRIBUNAL:

"Myron C. Cramer, Major General, Acting President."

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Brooks.

MR. BROOKS: Mr. President, it might be well to state that the record shows that the Commission met at 1400 and the part that was just read by the Clerk was read by Mr. Lynch on the request of the Commissioner -- at the top of page 3.

Now, continuing on page 5, at the top of page 5. (Reading):

THE COMMISSIONER: I will ask my associate

to administer the oath to the witness. 1 2 3 KIJURO SHIDEHARA, called as a witness 4 on behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified in English as follows: 6 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr. Brooks. You 7 have the affidavit? MR. BROOKS: I have defense document No. 1964, 8 9 the affidavit of SHIDEHARA, Kijuro. Haven't we the 10 original here? 11 MR. LYNCH: Yes, sir. 12 MR. BROOKS: You had better give him that. 13 (Whereupon, a document was handed 14 to the witness.) 15 DIRECT EXAMINATION 16 BY MR. BROOKS: 17 You are looking at defense document 1964, 18 Baron SHIDEHARA. Is that your affidavit? 19 1964, yes. 20 Is that your affidavit? 21 Yes, that is my affidavit. 22 Are the contents thereof true and correct? 23 Yes. 24

MR. BROOKS: We offer defense document 1964,

the affidavit of SHIDEHARA, Kijuro, into evidence.

25

1 to administer the oath to the witness. 2 KIJURO SHIDEHARA, called as a witness 3 on behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified in English as follows: 6 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr. Brooks. You 7 have the affidavit? MR. BROOKS: I have defense document No. 1964, 8 9 the affidavit of SHIDEHARA, Kijuro. Haven't we the 10 original here? 11 MR. LYNCH: Yes, sir. 12 MR. BROOKS: You had better give him that. 13 (Whereupon, a document was handed 14 to the witness.) 15 DIRECT EXAMINATION 16 BY MR. BROOKS: 17 You are looking at defense document 1964, 18 Baron SHIDEHARA. Is that your affidavit? 19 1964, yes. 20 Is that your affidavit? 21 Yes, that is my affidavit. A 22 Are the contents thereof true and correct? 23 Yes.

MR. BROOKS: We offer defense document 1964,

the affidavit of SHIDEHARA, Kijuro, into evidence.

	THE COMMISSIONER: It will be received and
marko	d with the letter "A" for identification.
	(Whereupon, document No. 1964 was
	marked defense exhibit A and received in
	evidence.)
	Do you wish to supplement it? (End reading)
	MR. BROOKS: At this time may it be given a
egul	ar exhibit number, your Honor?
- 1	ACTING PRESIDENT: It may be given exhibit
Io. 3	479-A.
	(Whereupon, exhibit A was marked
	defense exhibit No. 3479-A and received in
	evidence.)
, 1	

AR. BROOKS: (Reading continued)

not wish to supplement it. I do not know whether it is necessary to read it at this time or not.

THE COLLISSIONER: If counsel are agreed,
I suggest we do not take time reading it but that the
court reporter merely transcribe it as if, indeed, it
had been read.

...R. BROOKS: Then may it be transcribed starting with paragraph 2 as if I had read the affidavit.

THE COMMISSIONER: Might I suggest you start at 1 which describes the witness.

AR. BROOKS: All right. I'll start at 1, then. On the date of the oath in the back, there is an error there. That should be July 28, 1947. It appears as 1931 by error. (End reading)

That is on page 3 of exhibit 3479A, if your Honor please. Also on page 9 this same error appears. It was copied in the record. I ask that that correction be made: "July 28, 1931" be changed to "July 28, 1947."

(Reading continued):

"1. Ly name is SHIDEHARA, Kijuro. Ly age is 76, having been born in 1872. Ly address is No.

3

1

4 5

6

8

9

10

12

13

15

16 17

18

19

20

22

23

1219, Okanoto-Lachi, Setagaya, Tokyo.

"2. At the time of the Mukden Incident of September 18th, 1931, I was the Foreign Minister, while General MINAMI was the War Minister, both being members of the WAKATSUKI Cabinet.

"On the morning of September 19, i.e., the next day after the outbreak of the Incident, an extraordinary Cabinet meeting was called. On that occasion, I reported the receipt of a telegram from the Japanese Consul-General in Mukden to the Foreign Office, stating that a little after 10 o'clock of the 18th the Chinese troops had blown up the South Manchurian Railway lines in the vicinity of Liutiokuo, Mukden -- (end reading)

That is misspelled there. It should be: L-i-u (dash) T-i-! (dash) K-u-o.

(Reading continued):

-- and clashed with our railway garrison.

War Minister MINAMI then reported that he also had received a similar telegram from the Kwantung Army.

As these telegraphic reports from the district concerned were very brief, the situation was too obscure for the government to make any judgment at that time. (end reading)

I would like to submit here, if the Court

2

1

4

6

8

9

11

12

14

15 16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

3

5

6

7

9

10

12 13

14

15 16

17 18

19 20

21

23

24

please, that this paragraph is to clear up a statement made by SHIDLHARA as prosecution witness at page 1339 of the record. The next paragraph is numbered 2 by error. "2" should be stricken. It was corrected on the errata sheet.

(Reading continued)

thereafter and the situation on the spot became gradually distinct. Hence, War Minister MINAMI declared that the central army authorities (the General Staff and the War Office) should make every possible effort to prevent the expansion of the Incident, although the action of the Kwantung Army originated from its proper aim of guarding the railway. All the members of the Cabinet, being in accord therewith, decided upon the Government policy of non-expansion, which was proclaimed at home and aborad on September 24.

on December 10, 1931. Up to that time, however, I did my best, always in cooperation with War minister minami, to prevent the aggravation of the Incident. It is, therefore, simply a mischievous rumor spread by persons, who do not know the true facts, to circulate such an unfounded story as the one purporting that I had come into loggerheads with War minister

MINAMI on account of our maintenance of opposite ideas
at meetings of the Cabinet and that the friction between us two extended even to our personal emotions.

Actually from that time to this day I have been on
intimate terms with General MINAMI." (end reading)

At this point I would like to submit for
the reference of the Court page 20065 and 6 as to
what MINAMI says about the TANAKA statement of this
mischievous rumor as to opposition between SHIDEHARA

what MINAMI says about the TANAKA statement of this mischievous rumor as to opposition between SHIDEHARA and MINAMI which is one thing that this part is put in to meet. I also wish to refer the Fribunal to SHIDEHARA's testimony on page 1334, line 13 to page 1335, line 7; page 1376, line 16 to 21; page 1338, lines 13 to 18. If the Court sees fit, I will omit reading the oath.

ACTING PRESIDENT: That is not necessary.

MR. BROOKS: (Reading continued)

THE COMMISSIONER: Have you any supplementary questions?

TR. BROOKS: I have no supplementary questions, and the prosecution may cross-examine.

THE COMMISSIONER: Please do so, Mr. Carr. (End reading)

I.R. BROOKS: Mr. Carr will take over now, I understand.

,

MR. WARREN: If the Tribunal please, at this time, representing the accused DOHIHARA, I desire to object to all of the cross-examination commencing on page 10 and continuing through to page 43 of the exhibit.

ACTING PRESIDENT: I do not understand why you counsel do not seem to understand the procedure of the Court. Your various objections will be entertained as they come up and not en bloc.

understand the position of counsel. That is what I want to make plain. I am certain the Tribunal has not as yet understood the position of this counsel.

ACTING PRESIDENT: We will not have another argument. But, if you have individual objections, you may state them.

SHIDEHARA 33,554

Morse & Whalen

14.

MR. WARREN: Your Honor, I do have, and I should like to be heard on it. I will make it as brief as possible.

The objection which I made embraces testimony brought before the Commission by the prosecution concerning the accused DOHIHARA and is outside the scope of the affidavit and in no way touches it. Now, we were not notified that this hearing would take place although the prosecution undoubtedly knew that they intended to introduce evidence against General DOHIHARA. The Charter provides, among other things, that the Tribunal shall be conducted in a language understandable to the accused, yet there is no Japanese copy of this, and, consequently, my Japanese counsel is still uninformed except as I have been able to do through an interpreter, and we have been unable to discuss this.

I am sorry, your Honor, Mr. Comyns Carr informs me that I am completely wrong, there is a Japanese copy. It has never been served on us. Mr. Brooks
apparently does not have one because I searched diligently for it and have not been able to receive one.

I should like to refer the Tribunal, my objection only goes to this -- this might straighten something out -- my objection only goes to B through J,

SHILEHARA 33,555

that is all that they are. These are introduced one right after the other. They are, as you know, your honor, a series of telegrams purporting to give the situation in Manchuria. The accused MINAMI on the witness stand, at page 19, 821 of the record, admits that he was informed at all times, so the purpose of the cross-examination could not be directed at him because it could not possible impeach him, he admitted it.

I should like to read the question and the answer, which is short:

"Q Did Baron SHIDEHARA, the Foreign Minister, keep you informed from time to time of the reports that he was receiving from the consuls in Menchuria and China?" The answer is "Yes."

THE MONITOR: Mr. Warren, what document is that, sir?

MR. WARREN: That is the record, page 19,821 of the record for April 11, 1947.

Further in the cross-examination of the accused MINAMI and commencing at page 19,888 of the record for April 14, 1947, the prosecution by cross-examination attempted to go into the very same matters which they did in this Commission hearing. Now, I don't want to read this record, but I do wish that the

SHIDEHARA 33,556

Tribunal would look at it at some later time.

I made several objections to Mr. Carr's attempt to cross-examine a witness from a document which the witness had not seen. I even went so far as to become so impertinent as to say that I thought they did not have any such documents. After a considerable discussion with the President of the Court in which I asked that Mr. Carr be required to mark his exhibits for identification so that we might meet them when DOHIHARA's case came up, the President made this remark, which appears on page 19,892 of the record. This remark was directed to Mr. Comyns Carr.

"The President: In such case, you ought to tender the document for identification if you refer to it, but that is all you can be expected to do."

Previously, on page 19,890 of the record,
the President had told Mr. Carr the following: "If
you expressly refer to documents not already in evidence, then, following the practice of this Tribunal,
we will ask you to tender it for identification at
the end of the examination." There were other remarks
at that time, and if the Tribunal will read the record it
will find out that I am absolutely correct.

Now, if the Tribunal please, it is more than passing strange that the identical references made at

SHIDEHARA 33,557

the time that I quoted the record are the identical things which were introduced in a case against MINAMI when the accused DOHIHARA was not represented. I may be in error, but there is no doubt in my mind that the documents which were introduced in this hearing that we are now discussing were in the hands of Mr. Comyns Carr on that day and were not marked for identification. Had they felt that they were admissible they could have offered them at that time when the accused DOHIHARA was completely represented, and at a time when the witness was available on that witness stand for cross-examination.

Now, we were precluded because -- I mean precluded from answering these documents in our case in chief for DOHIHARA because the prosecution chose not to follow the advice and request of the Tribunal. And inasmuch as we were not represented before this hearing, were not invited, were not notified, and have not been served with Japanese copies, we feel that to permit these to come in would be a great injustice at this time, especially when a mere -- especially when the slightest perusal will indicate to the Court that they are directed against DOHIHARA and not MINAMI, and are not within the scope of the affidavit.

SHIDEHARA

MR. BROOKS: If the Tribunal please, I would like to object -- enter a similar objection, limited to part of the affidavit from page 10 to page 63, if the Court wishes to hear me, and I could cover all of that at this time. Otherwise I will abide by whatever ruling the Court says.

I wasn't intending to raise any objection until it came up at a later period but we can do it all at one time if the Court so desires and save time.

ACTING PRESIDENT: That was the ruling of the Court.

Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: May it please the Tribunal, the long dissertation, prefaced with the expression it was going to be short, to which we have just listened only illustrates the inconvenience of disregarding the directions of the Tribunal. The objections when they come to be heard turn out not to be general at all, with one exception, but particular relating to each document.

The only general one is that my friend Mr. Warren was not personally notified that in the course of the cross-examination of Baron SHIDEHARA on commission his client, DOHIHARA, would be mentioned. Actually, I received a message from the defense asking whether

33,559

SHIDEHARA

SHIGEMITSU would be mentioned in the course of the cross-examination and I replied that SHIGEMITSU, as far as I could see, would not but DOHIHARA would. If that message, which was no obligation as far as I know on the prosecution to give, did not reach my friend Mr. Warren, I am sorry. And if he did not choose to attend the proceedings as a matter of precaution, which my friend Mr. Furness on behalf of SHIGEMITSU in spite of that message did do, that isn't the prosecution's fault. In any case, he is in no way prejudiced because the documents were admitted subject to objection and here he is taking the objection.

Now, when it comes to the objection itself, it is supported by much inaccuracy. That happened is this: During the cross-examination of MINAMI, MINAMI reneatedly stated that although SHIDEHARA had some times spoken to him in the cabinet about reports that he was receiving from consuls in China, he denied that SHIDEHARA had ever sent him a copy of any of them or shown any of them to him, and with regard to each of these particular documents he denied specifically that the subject matter of them had ever been mentioned to him by SHIDEHARA.

MR. PROOKS: If the Tribunal please, I would like the reference to the record on a statement like

SHIDFHARA 33,560

that because I don't believe the record bears the prosecution out.

MR. COMYNS CARR: In due course that shall be

In each case -- I think I am right in saying every one but the majority of them at all events and I think I can refer to the record for every one of them having asked him first of all whether he had been shown these reports, and he denied ever seeing any of them, I then put questions to him based upon the contents of them. It was at that point that the discussion arose, part of which has been referred to out of its context by my friend Mr. Warren, at page 19,889 of the record. Having put to him a question based upon the document -the two documents which are now exhibits F and G to this affidavit, arren then took the objection and made the observation to which he referred that he didn't believe any document existed, and then claimed that the document should be marked for identification. And I then drew attention to the ruling which the Tribunal had given that morning that unless there was a document which the witness could prove as being his own document there was no necessity to produce it as the witness wouldn't be able to recognize it, it couldn't be marked as an exhibit, and there was no necessity to have it

4

5

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

SHIDFHARA 33,560

that because I don't believe the record bears the prosecution out.

MR. COMYNS CARR: In due course that shall be

In each case -- I think I am right in saying every one but the majority of them at all events and I think I can refer to the record for every one of them -having asked him first of all whether he had been shown these reports, and he denied ever seeing any of them, I then put questions to him based upon the contents of them. It was at that point that the discussion arose, part of which has been referred to out of its context by my friend Mr. Warren, at page 19,889 of the record. Having put to him a question based upon the document -the two documents which are now exhibits F and G to this affidavit, arren then took the objection and made the observation to which he referred that he didn't believe any document existed, and then claimed that the document should be marked for identification. And I then drew attention to the ruling which the Tribunal had given that morning that unless there was a document which the witness could prove as being his own document there was no necessity to produce it as the witness wouldn't be able to recognize it, it couldn't be marked as an exhibit, and there was no necessity to have it

4

5

8

10

9

12

13

11

14

15

17

19

20

21

22

23 24

```
marked for identification, and that questions could be
   put on a matter of fact whether the facts were obtained
   from a document or not.
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
```

```
marked for identification, and that questions could be
   put on a matter of fact whether the facts were obtained
2
   from a document or not.
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

D u 28 S p r C.

At page 19,891, I submitted to the Tribunal in these words: "But the question is, at what stage it is proper to produce the document; and, in my submission, unless it is a document which the witness can identify of his own knowledge, the proper stage is in rebuttal."

And again I submitted: "When I am merely putting a question without reference to the document as a document, the fact that the question is based upon a document is immaterial and does not require it to be produced at that stage."

The President said: "Well, is there anything in doubt? Proceed with the cross-examination."

And I proceeded, as I had been doing before the objection was taken.

Now, if MINAMI had admitted, as SHIDEHARA has now sworn, that SHIDEHARA supplied him with a copy of every one of these documents, then the document could properly have been put in during the crossexamination of MINAMI, but MINAMI denied it repeatedly, of which an example is on page 19,904, where I was cross-examining him about a document already exhibited, exhibit 300, and he replied: "At that time not one single telegram was sent around to us from the Foreign Office, and I did not hear of

16

17

19

18

20

21 22

23

24

1

4

5

6 7

8

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

that from SHIDEHARA; and, as a matter of fact, I heard of it for the very first time in this very Tribunal the other day." And he repeated that over and over again with regard to numbers of these telegrams he was asked about, and he simply said, "No, I never saw any of them."

Naturally, the defense is anxious to exclude from evidence of the Tribunal the fact that SHIDEHARA has sworn the exact opposite, that he sent him a copy of every one.

The objection taken by my friend Mr. Warren would exclude the whole of his answers relating to that matter; and so, I think, would the objection which my friend Mr. Brooks is taking.

33,564

CHIDEHARA

SHIDEHARA's answer that he had sent MINAMI copies of all of them applied, first of all, to the whole of those -- of which there were a considerable number -- which have already been exhibited.

It applied, secondly, to the whole of the additional documents of the same kind, namely, consular reports tendered in the cross-examination, all of which, of course, would have appeared without wasting the time of the Tribunal if I had been allowed to read the cross-examination and the objection had been taken at the proper time.

The whole of these documents are, therefore, in the first place, evidence against MINAMI, because SHIDEHARA, contradicting MINAMI's statement, has sworn that he sent a copy of each of them to MINAMI at the time it was received. No doubt most of them also referred to LOHIHARA, and are in a different sense and from a different point of view also evidence against DOHIHARA. All of them could have been tendered in rebuttal, founded upon the questions put to MINAMI and his denials; and if any opportunity for the purpose had been given during the presentation of DOHIHARA's case, they could also have been used in cross-examination then, and if denied, that would have been a further

SHIDEHARA 33,565

ground for tendering them in rebuttal. It might or might not have been necessary, in rebuttal, to have tendered on behalf of the prosecution, a further affidavit by SHIDEHARA stating that he had sent the copies of them to MINAMI; however, the defense have saved us that trouble by calling SHIDEHARA and giving us the opportunity of cross-examining him.

The last objection, I understand, is that this matter is not within the scope of the affidavit. The affidavit is one purporting to cover the whole of the Manchurian Incident down to the resignation of the WAKATSUKI Cabinet on December 10, 1931. And I refer in particular to the sentence at the beginning of paragraph 3 of the affidavit on page 8 of the record:

"The WAKATSUKI Cabinet resigned en bloc on December 10, 1931. Up to that time, however, I did my best, always in cooperation with War Minister MINAMI, to prevent the aggravation of the incident."

To enable the Tribunal to judge of the extent and value of MINAMI's cooperation, it is obviously helpful, in my submission, to know what information SHIDEHARA supplied to MINAMI in order to ask what steps -- to consider with MINAMI's own evidence -- what steps if any he took upon that information.

ACTING PRESIDENT: We will take a recess for

SHIDEHARA 33,566

fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was taken until 1100, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: I think I have covered all the ground, and, with regard to the individual exhibits, it would probably be more convenient if I gave the record references to them as I come to each one, but if the Tribunal desires to have them all now, I can give them all now.

ACTING PRESIDENT: The Tribunal would prefer to hear them now.

MR. COMYNS CARR: If your Honor please, I would just like to say that, in my submission, for the purpose of introducing documents in the cross-cxamination of the witness SHIDEHARA, it is not in the least necessary that the contents of them should have been put to MINAMI.

The subject matter of exhibit B was referred to in MINAMI's cross-examination at pages 19,879 and 19,895 to -6; exhibit C, also pages 19,895 to -6.

2

1

3

5

0 1 f

¹ 7 & 8

L 9 e f 10

11

13

14

16

17 18

19

20

22

23

24

MR. BROOKS: If your Honor please, I think it is irrelevant and immaterial what appears in MINAMI's testimony. The basis for this admission of this evidence is that it is within the scope of this affidavit, and it has nothing whatsoever to do with anything about trying to plug holes in some case or get their own witness, the prosecution witness, to change their whole story after he has been cross-examined and re-examined.

ACTING PRESIDENT: The Tribunal has just indicated its desire that these be read at the present time. You will please continue with the reading, Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: The subject matter of exhibit D was referred to at pages 19,881 to -2; exhibit E, also page 19,882; exhibit F, pages 19,888 to -94. The length of that reference is due to the fact that it was on that particular occasion that the argument took place as to whether the document should be produced for identification or not. Exhibit G, also in the course of the same pages; exhibit H, pages 19,909 to -12, exhibit I, pages 19,883 to -4; exhibit J, pages 19,883 to -4 and also pages 19,895 to -6.

Yes, those are all, and at most of those

pages, if not all of them -- I think, all of them -it will be found that MINAMI denied having seen any
such telegrams or heard any such report from
SHIDEHARA. There are also numerous other pages on
which the same matters were referred to, besides
those I have mentioned.

The only other thing I have to say is that I find I was wrong in saying the Japanese copy of the whole of this transcript of the commission evidence has been served, but copies of the exhibits in English and Japanese have been served -- distributed to the whole of the defense.

MR. WARREN: If the Tribunal please, references counsel has just given to the Tribunal are, in the main, the ones that I refer to along the same place. Counsel states that the subject matter of these telegrams were referred to. We well knew that at the time. We asked him if he would, and the Tribunal suggested to him that he mark them for identification. MINAMI never saw them. Counsel states to the Tribunal, in substance, that it would be useless to show MINAMI the telegrams, because he had merely seen them and they were not of his own creation.

Since counsel chose to refer in all the

reports, MINAMI said he had such reports.

Now, if your Honor please, I want to refer specifically to the quotation of counsel, from the record on page 19,904, in which only part of the record was quoted and would leave the impression with the Tribunal, unless they had a copy of the record in front of them, that we were talking about the Mukden Incident, as all these exhibits, which were introduced before the commission, were.

Now, your Honor, it is true that he was asked if he was not so informed by SHIDEHARA at that time, and he said, "No," but in that instance, your Honor, and in the question before, it was very plain, because Mr. Comyns Carr asked him, "Isn't it the truth, as stated by KUWASHIMA in exhibit 300 ...," which we answered and which we brought evidence in to show that it was pure, rank hearsay.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Can't you cut your sentences a little shorter, Colonel Warren?

MR. WARREN: Yes, I shall, sir. I realize my error.

Now, your Honor, let's look at the reference given to the Court by my friend on page 19,888 to see whether or not MINAMI denied these things that counsel said he did. The question: "Were you informed in the Cabinet that HAYASHI, the Consul General, had reported on the 16th and 19th of October that DOHIHARA was retiring in favor of a Chinaman nominated by himself?" The answer in part, he starts out: "No -- yes, I do not know exactly how long ago DOHIHARA was Mayor." He didn't dany it there.

Counsel says he did in the next question; and that next question is, "Were you informed that the Japanese officials who had assisted DOHIHARA as mayor were in the future to act as advisers to his Chinese successor?", but I am unable to read in there the suggestions made by Mr. Carr.

Now, your Honor, to get away from the quotations, because I asked the Tribunal to read all of that and determine for themselves. But counsel himself states that this would be good on rebuttal. I agreed with him at the time, I still agree with him,

ACTING PRESIDENT: Can't you cut your sentences a little shorter, Colonel Warren?

MR. WARREN: Yes, I shall, sir. I realize my error.

Now, your Honor, let's look at the reference given to the Court by my friend on page 19,888 to see whether or not MINAMI denied these things that counsel said he did. The question: "Were you informed in the Cabinet that HAYASHI, the Consul General, had reported on the 16th and 19th of October that DOHIHARA was retiring in favor of a Chinaman nominated by himself?" The answer in part, he starts out: "No -- yes, I do not know exactly how long ago DOHIHARA was Mayor." He didn't dany it there.

Counsel says he did in the next question; and that next question is, "Were you informed that the Japanese officials who had assisted DOHIHARA as mayor were in the future to act as advisers to his Chinese successor?", but I am unable to read in there the suggestions made by Mr. Carr.

Now, your Honor, to get away from the quotations, because I asked the Tribunal to read all of that and determine for themselves. But counsel himself states that this would be good on rebuttal. I agreed with him at the time, I still agree with him,

if there would be any rebuttal testimony that it might be good at that time, subject to proper objection. However, the fact remains that it is not rebuttal. It was used at a time when we were not notified. Mr. Carr knows I represent DOHIHARA, and he admits that I was not given notice. He now admits that there was no Japanese copy as I first told the Tribunal.

I submit, your Honor, that the quotations given by counsel are not correct as to the meaning which he hopes to convey to the Tribunal because it refers to other incidents.

I submit that the entire proceedings with reference to the accused DOHIHARA, had before the commission, was an attempt upon the part of the prosecution to do by indirection what they would not be permitted to do directly in this Tribunal.

I submit, further, that my objection is timely because it has to do with a series of documents all related and so indicated by the prosecution markings.

I submit that the Charter provides that an accused is entitled to have counsel represent him at any stage of the proceedings in which evidence is taken against him. I submit that that was not complied

/ 13

with, not through any fault of counsel. Law is not a question of hide and seek; it is a question of bring it in the open before the Tribunal, and I resent the fact that I was not notified so I could have been there and presented my objections to Lord Northcroft at the time.

with, not through any fault of counsel. Law is not a question of hide and seek; it is a question of bring it in the open before the Tribunal, and I resent the fact that I was not notified so I could have been there and presented my objections to Lord Northcroft at the time.

,

Kappleau & Kn

p

1

2

3

4

7

8

9

ACTING PRESIDENT: I don't think we care to

hear any more of vour argument, Mr. Carr.

Captain Brooks, inasmuch as Colonel Warren has brought up the point that the documents presented by the prosecution go beyond the scope of the witness' affidavit, I think it would be convenient for the Court to hear your argument on that point now.

the record, at page 19,891, that in relation to these documents which the prosecution were supposedly cross-examining MINAMI on, as we expected at that time, the prosecution should have put these documents into evidence if the witness denied them. To make it clear what the ruling of the Court might be in such a case, I stated as follows at line 7 on page 19,891:

"Mr. Brooks: I take it, your Honor, that if the prosecution asks the witness on a document that he says he has, as to what the witness has stated, and the witness states he does not or he doesn't say it, the prosecution is bound by the answer unless the prosecution puts the document into evidence to show that he didn't state otherwise."

Mr. Comyns Carr interrupted and said:
"Your Honor, nobody would dispute that proposition, but the question is, at what stage it is proper to

11

12

10

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

21

23

24

produce a document, and in my submission unless it is a document which the witness can identify of his own bnowledge, the proper stage is in returnal."

Continuing:

We are talking on matters that occurred 25 or 26 years ago, the witness should at the close at least be given a chance to refresh his recollection on what was said, and to call back into his mind those facts. We should also have the right of redirect examination over the same points if there is any matter that needs clearing up.

"Mr. Carr: Your Honor, I put my questions quite clearly and in my submission it couldn't help the witness to look at a document unless it is his own document.

"The President: In such case you ought to tender the document for identification if you refer to it. That is all you can be expected to do.

mit, however, that when I am merely putting a question without reference to the document as a document, the fact that the question is based on a document is immaterial and does not require it to be produced at that stage."

Now we see that the purpose was not as last stated by the prosecutor, that since the witness was not given a chance to refresh his recollection and the documents were not marked for identification, the prosecutor is now trying to say that these are the documents which he showed to the witness.

I withdraw that last statement because the documents were not shown to the witness; but that these were the documents upon which the witness was questioned.

If he had been trying to test his credibility at that time he would have, after asking him about the documents, have offered them to show that such and such documents were within this man's knowledge. He would not have had to produce them from a Foreign Office file because if they had been sent from the Foreign Office -- copies of them -- to the War Ministry, he could have produced them from the War Ministry files. I think that I would produce evidence upon this in the future, to show that such documents were not in the War Ministry files and never had been, if it becomes necessary to meet this matter as new evidence.

However, I state that the Court should hold the prosecution as bound by the answer of this witness, for the prosecution failed to produce the documents at that time, which was the proper time. I further state that

-6

this is not the proper way to impeach a witness. If the witness had been questioned on the documents and then they had been marked for identification, or shown, or offered in evidence, that would be a way, but there is no proof that this is the document shown at the time and the witness has not had the chance to refresh his recollection thereon or to amend his answer, after becoming acquainted with the details, if he did deny it.

ACTING PRESIDENT: What we are particularly interested in hearing from you at the present time is your argument that these documents go beyond the affidavit of the witness.

MR. BROOKS: I am going into that right now, sir. I am not stating that MINAMI denies this, because I have not had a chance to check the record. However, I do state that in this case he has not been given an opportunity to refresh his recollection or to deny the documents presented before the commission.

Now, my objection to the matter on crossexamination covers from the last question on page 10 to the last question on page 63 as being improper, cross-examination not within the scope of the affidavit. I might refer the Court for an argument on that to record page 1356, line 22, to court record page 1360, line 14, for the argument by Justice Mansfield of the prosecution on limiting cross-examination to matters concerned within the examination in chief which has been adopted by this court; and also a reference to court record page 1369, lines 2 to 19, for Mansfield's argument that the prosecution should be furnished documents at least twenty-four hours in advance before a witness can be questioned; and under similar circumstances, at pages 1370 and 1371, the Tribunal states: "You cannot use such documents until you have complied with the rules."

That is why at the time of the taking of

1

3

4

5

7

8

10

11

13

14

15 16

17

18

20

21

23

24

this commission this type of cross-examination was unexpected, and I did not have the record of the testimony of SHIDEHARA or MINAMI before me for reexamination on matters covered by the prosecution which were outside the scope of the affidavit and conflict in many instances with the previous testimony of SHIDEHARA in some ways which can only be found by examination of the record, which was not available before the commission at SHIDEHARA's home.

If we had had twenty-four hours service of notice, I would have taken objection to the last question on page 10 at the time, because the answer appears to this question at record page 1324, June 25, 1946, starting at line 7. Therefore my objection is that it is not only repetitious but is outside the scope of the direct examination or of the affidavit.

It might also be stated that on page 1333 the prosecution witness SHIDEHARA at that time denied receiving official reports and said he only heard rumors. See his answer at line 18, page 1333. This matter was not only repetitious then, but it was covered again on redirect examination at record page 1384 over objection of being repetitious and trying to get the witness to change his previous answers.

12.

On page 11 I refer the Tribunal to page 19,910, line 14, to page 19,915 where the witness MINAMI on cross-examination deals with this matter of DOHIHARA as not being one of his officers, and his counsel admits there that DOHIHARA was not under the chain of command of MINAMI.

THE MONITOR: Whose counsel is this, Mr. Brooks?

MR. BROOKS: DOHIHARA's counsel, Mr. Warren; and also on 19,916 and 19,917, which show that this is immaterial and irrelevant besides being repetitious.

Now, this affidavit, if the Court will notice, covers a period from September 18 to December 10, 1931, on three matters. Going to page 7, I will point out the three matters on which I took an affidavit from a prosecution witness.

Point 1, in the center of page 7. that War Minister MINAMI reported that he also had received a similar telegram from the Kwantung Army.

At the top of page 8, point 2, that all the members of the cabinet decided upon the government policy of non-expansion, which was proclaimed at home and abroad on September 24 and which I offered in evidence and it was rejected.

On point 3, as to the mischievous rumor

of the unfounded story of their being at loggerheads with the Yar Minister, MINAMI. Now, the prosecution in the cross-examination deal with point 3 at page 66, and the only place he touches, in my opinion, on points 1 and 2 is in the first question at page 10, and in between the last question on page 10 to the last question on page 63 is cross-examination on matters that are not proper and which I am objecting to in toto and which. I may state, covers that portion of the cross-examination objected to by other defense counsel.

ACTING PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until 1:30.

(Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was taken.)

Greenborg & Yelden

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International

Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Brooks.

MR. BROOKS: If the Tribunal please, continuing my objection as to specific questions, on June 25 and 26, 1946, the prosecution offered exhibit 156, SHIDEHARA's affidavit, and the testimony from 1318 and 1398 covered the matters from the last question on page 10 of this Commission, exhibit 3479, to the last question on page 63 thereof.

As to the question on page 15 of this exhibit 3479 as to the prosecution's impeaching this witness, I wish to compare the testimony of SHIDEHARA, line 10, page 1334, where he said as a prosecution witness, "I merely talked to MINAMI about these reports." The allowance of a question as set out on page 15 of this exhibit would allow the prosecution to impeach their own witness.

On page 20 I objected to the prosecution document 1767A(5), marked B for identification, and as to all the documents from C to J, I renewed this objection as their being outside the scope of the

Colonel Woolworth has handled MINAMI's case up until this time and Mr. Carr has always handled DOHIHARA's case, this suspicious circumstance in itself led me to make the statement that it is not only outside the scope of the affidavit and not proper cross-examination but that they deal with DOHIHARA and it is an attempt to introduce new evidence outside the direct examination through a witness who had appeared generally for the prosecution and whose testimony for the defense was limited in this affidavit to the three matters in the individual case of MINAMI.

Now, as to MINAMI's denying seeing certain telegrams, I have only had time to check a few places but at page 19,879 of the record of 14 April 1947, he said that he did not see the telegram as to the Self-Government Guidance Board in Mukden but that SHIDEHARA spoke to him of the reports thereon. I submit to the Tribunal the question of whether it would discredit this witness MINAMI to show that he may have been mistaken where he has not denied knowledge of the rumors or reported facts therein.

Now see record page 19,878, line 22, and 19,888 to 19,892 where MINAMI reports he knew DOHI-HARA was mayor for one month from the HAYASHI report.

Colonel Woolworth has handled MINAMI's case up until this time and Mr. Carr has always handled DOHIHARA's case, this suspicious circumstance in itself led me to make the statement that it is not only outside the scope of the affidavit and not proper cross-examination but that they deal with DOHIHARA and it is an attempt to introduce new evidence outside the direct examination through a witness who had appeared generally for the prosecution and whose testimony for the defense was limited in this affidavit to the three matters in the individual case of MINAMI.

Now, as to MINAMI's denying seeing certain telegrams, I have only had time to check a few places but at page 19,879 of the record of 14 April 1947, he said that he did not see the telegram as to the Self-Government Guidance Board in Mukden but that SHIDEHARA spoke to him of the reports thereon. I submit to the Tribunal the question of whether it would discredit this witness MINAMI to show that he may have been mistaken where he has not denied knowledge of the rumors or reported facts therein.

Now see record page 19,878, line 22, and 19,888 to 19,892 where MINAMI reports he knew DOHI-HARA was mayor for one month from the HAYASHI report.

33,583 SHIDEHARA

All these documents offered are from Foreign Office 1 files. I submit also that that is not the best

evidence of their having been sent to the War Ministry and I ask why were not the War Ministry files

produced or accounted for as to such documents.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, I submit there should be a limit to the amount of repetition.

MR. BROOKS: Wait until I get through; then you can answer.

MR. COMYNS CARR: I am not seeking to answer. I am objecting to counsel repeating himself and putting over and over again the same arguments that he has put in the course of three and a quarter hours of wasting the time of this Tribunal.

ACTING PRESIDENT: I understood that counsel was referring to different specific instances.

MR. BROOKS: That is right. I have very little more, if your Honor please. I will ignore the interruption.

The prosecution, I submit, has set up a straw man to knock down and to try to confuse the issues before this Court. As evidence, go to page 36 where my objection is in relation to further testimony as to a new regime in Manchuria, prosecution document 1767A(17), identified as exhibit H.

2 3

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

I submit that MINAMI does not deny knowledge as to the facts set out as may be seen at page 20,063 of the record where MINAMI states SHIDEHARA and MINAMI both sent telegrams to prevent any Japanese from interfering in or participating in such movements as were rumored.

Recently, at record page 32,861 and also 32,862, I covered these telegrams, exhibits 286 and 299, sent by these men and it is clear from an examination here that, although MINAMI denied at the time that he knew, later he found out through SHIDEHARA a few days later as this evidence shows.

13

. 1

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

The part on page 43 of this exhibit 3479 is also objected to as being an attempt to get the witness to change testimony that he gave on cross-

examination as a prosecution witness, made at page

1334 and fallowing said page; and again on page 45

of this exhibit 3479 another attempt was made to

change the testimony of SHIDEHARA here.

I wish to refer the Tribunal to page 1392, line 17 for SHIDEHARA's statement on redirect examination as to the Kwantung Army having materials on hand and that any idea of cutting off supplies was, therefore, impossible as a step to suppress the spread of the incident.

Again on page 49, more repetitious matter is found, and I refer the Court to page 1392, line 17 for SHIDEHARA's previous statement thereon which the prosecution again tried to get him to change at page 50.

I refer the Court to record page 19916 and 19917 and to 20054 to 20056 as to the matter on page 50. Here the prosecution got their former witness to change his testimony to a certain extent.

However, cross-examination later clarified this somewhat. Maybe I should have said redirect.

As to page 55, I refer to the 14 April,

1947, record page 19873 to 19875 and a reference to page 20061 to 20062 as to investigations made of this rumor proving it to be without foundation and showing these questions to be repetitious.

At page 57 I objected to all this as outside the affidavit, and I stated that to save time I wished I could enter a continuing objection. This would bring me down to the last question on the bottom of page 63. The balance from there on is, in my opinion, within the scope of the affidavit, possibly, and admissible.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Furness.

understand my name was mentioned this morning, and I would, therefore, like to say something with regard to that. I came to Mr. Comyns Carr's room the morning that this Commission was to take testimony and was told that they did not know whether or not my client, Mr. SHIGEMITSU, would be involved in the cross-examination.

ACTING PRESIDENT: There was nothing derogatory said about you, Mr. Furness. I see no --

any statement, your Honor, that mention to me was made of any other defendant because I can say without

/

any hesitation that I only mentioned my client, Mr. SHIGEMITSU, and Mr. Comyns Carr at the Imperial Hotel said only my client would not be involved and that he did not say to me that Mr. Warren't client, Mr. DOHIHARA, might or would be involved.

ACTING PRESIDENT: We will let the matter rest right there. Whether he did or did not say that has no material bearing on the matter that we are considering.

MR. FURNESS: I can only say that if he had said any such thing to me, I would have immediately tried to get in touch with General DOHIHARA's counsel.

ACTING PRESIDENT: I do not think it is necessary to follow that.

MR. COMYNS CARR: I didn't propose to say anything about that, your Honor. I don't know if the Tribunal desires to hear me on any of the entirely new objections never mentioned before which Mr. Brooks raised in the course of what was supposed to be his reply to my argument on the objections which had been raised.

THE PRESIDENT: The Tribunal does not care to hear anything further. The Tribunal overrules the objections made by counsel for both DOHIHARA and

MINAMI.

MR. WARREN: May we have individual objections on these, to us, objectionable documents?

ACTING PRESIDENT: You were told long ago
that to any adverse rulings exceptions were automatically taken.

MR. WARREN: Your Honor, objections, not exceptions, sir.

MR. COMYNS CARR: May I be heard on that, your Honor?

ACTING PRESIDENT: Maybe I misunderstood you. May I ask you to repeat your request?

MR. WARREN: At the time these documents are read, some of them have objections inherent within the document itself which we have never objected to, and I should like to make my objection at that time.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, I should like to be heard on that question before the Tribunal gives any such permission.

ACTING PRESIDENT: We have heard very full and lengthy discussion of your objections, and we do not feel that we need any further discussion on any particular.

Morse whalen

1

5

9

10

11

12

MR. WARREN: No, your Honor, some of these objections the Court did not permit me to go into and I didn't do so, and those objections go to the document, the specific document, itself which I didn't go into.

I have been deprived of cross-examination and if the Tribunal doesn't want me to make those objections I shan't do so.

ACTING PRESIDENT: That is the universal feeling of the Tribunal.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Now I will read the crossexamination, beginning at page 10, line 6. (Reading:) CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY M. COMYNS C.. KR:

Q Baron SHIDEHARA, I see you say that up to the time of the resignation of the WAKATSUKI Cabinet you did your best always in cooperation with War Minister MINAMI to prevent the aggravation of the incident.

A Yes.

Q Did you have reason to suppose before the incident actually occurred that something of the kind was about to happen?

I did. You see, I had no official information; but the civilian residents in Manchuria, quite many of them, four or five, they came to me, to the Foreign Office, and they said that something extraordinary

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

24

was going on. Some young officers came to them and ordered some help; they wanted certain things. I don't remember what things they were, but some certain things should be stored there at such place and some other things should be stored at other places, and so on. They didn't know why these young officers came to them and wanted those things, and so they naturally became suspicious that something was going on, some war-like preparation might be going on; and they asked me if I had any information about it. I said I had no information whatever. But, as they were men who were right there in Manchuria — in Mukden, in Harbin, and so forth — and I believed there must be something in those reports, I immediately rung up General MINARI, who was then Minister of War, and I said I had something to talk with him.

Manchuria came to me and asked me if I knew anything about these movements of your young officers; and I also became suspicious, so I said that the first thing for him would be to maintain the strictest discipline among these young officers there, not go out of their ordinary way, but they should mind their own business, not to go about seeking for some warlike materials to be stored at different places.

THE CONTISSIONER: Is this extending beyond

what is relevant?

MR. COMYNS CARR: No. I should have continued to ask about this if he hadn't told us.

MR. BROOKS: If your Honor please, I should like to object to this. This affidavit, if the Court will notice, covers a period between September 18 --

THE COMMISSIONER: Just a moment. Do state your objection very shortly. You want to say that it is not within the scope of the affidavit?

MR. BROOKS: That is right.

THE COMMISSIONER: Very well. I overrule you subject to your right to raise that again before the Tribunal. Will you continue then, Mr. Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: I would like the Baron to continue if the court reporter will just remind him where he got to.

MR. BROOKS: If your Honor please, I would like to make another objection that it is repetitious since this is also a prosecution witness, and it appears that what he is talking about is right in the record.

MR. BROOKS: He has been a prosecution witness, and he has testified about it.

THE COM ISSIONER: That objection will also

be noted for consideration by the Tribunal.

("hereupon, the official court reporter read as follows:)

"A ---- but they should mind their own business, not to go about seeking for some warlike
materials to be stored at different places."

Q Would you continue with what you wanted to say, Baron, from that point. This is what you were telling General MINAMI.

A Yes. I wanted to tell him that this is a very serious thing if the report is true, and I have every reason to believe that the reports are true. And he quite agreed with me, and he told me he would do his level best to maintain discipline among these officers. He had really been doing his level best already, but I reminded him he would try again if anything untoward might not happen.

Q Did he say what he would do?

A He didn't say what he would do, but I presumed that he would come into contact with the officers there in Manchuria.

I see. Now, after the incident broke out, did you receive a number of reports from your diplomatic and consular officers in China and Manchuria?

.

10 11

9

7

2

3

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

1 HC 3 th 4 5 ti 6 Tr 7

8

9

10

11

14

15

13

16

17

18 19

20

yes.

22

23

24 25 MR. BROOKS: I object to that, if your Honor please. The question is outside the scope of this affidavit. It is not proper cross-examination.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I per t the question subject to your right to resume it before the Tribunal.

Yes, you may answer the question, Baron STIDEHARA.

A Well, of course, we received a number of telegrams from our consuls in Mukden, Consul General in Mukden, and also from other consuls in other places.

Q Yes. Let me just remind you of their names. Was HAYASHI the Consul General in Mukden

A He was, yes, sir.

Q And was a man named MOISHIMA acting under him in Mukden?

A Yes, yes.

Q Was KUWASHI A the consul General in Tientsin?

A KUWASHIMA? I am sure he was in Tientsin,

Q Was ARAKAWA the Consul General in Yinkow and also in Niuchang?

A ARAKAWA? I don't remember.

Q You don't remember him? I may show you a

document regarding him. Was YAMAZAKI an official of the Foreign Office in Liaoyang? Do you remember him?

A I know him personally, but I can't say for a certainty whether he was in Liaoyang or in other places.

Was TSUKAMOTO the Governor General of Kwantung?

A Yes.

Q And was YANO the Counsellor in Peiping?

A Yes.

Q Do you remember receiving reports from all of those persons about what was happening in connection with the incident?

A It is very difficult for me to remember.

Q Yes. It may be necessary for me to show them to you. I thought, perhaps, we could save time if you remembered. Whatever reports you got from your subordinates on the spot, did you send copies of them to General MINAMI?

A I did.

Q Did you supply copies to anybody else other than General MINAMI?

A To the Prime Minister, WAKATSUKI.

Q Yes. Anybody olse?

0

5

6

7

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

20

21

23

24

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I don't think that I had sent copies to anybody else, only the Prime Minister and War Minister. Of course, I also sent a copy to the Navy Minister. Q The Navy Minister? A Yes. But, the particular question I want to ask you is, can yo say whether you did or did not send copies to the Chief of the General Staff? A I think I did, yes. I think I did. You think you did. Q I Yes, I think I did. Now, I had better ask you this: Did you

also, in the case of the more important ones, bring them up and discuss them in the Cabinet?

A After the incident?

Q Yes, after the incident.

Oh, yes.

MR. COMYNS CARR: I had better go through them now and get you to identify them. May I have, first of all, exhibit 2193, please? 2193, 4 and 6.

Q Is that one of those which you received and which you supplied General MINA II with a copy

It is so long time ago, it is very difficult to --

Q Yes, but let us try and see if we can't.

Do I understand you to say that you supplied General

MINAMI with copies of all those which you received?

- A Practically all of those telegrams.
- A I don't think I made any exception.
- Q You don't think you made any exception.
- A I don't think I made any exception.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Well, in that case, perhaps there is no object in going through them in detail so far as they are already exhibited.

THE COMMISSIONER: That is for you to de-

MR. BROOKS: I was going to object to his going through them. I can't see any use in going through these telegrams since they are already exhibits in evidence.

THE COMMISSIONER: There is no need to discuss it. Mr. Carr does not propose to.

MR. COMYNS CARR: The only other thing I had better do with regard to them in detail is, there are a large number from KUWASHIMA in Tientsin.

Q Are those included in your answer that you

25

20

21

22

23

1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Yes, but let us try and see if we can't. Do I understand you to say that you supplied General MINAMI with copies of all those which you received? Practically all of those telegrams. 0 Yes. I don't think I made any exception. You don't think you made any exception. I don't think I made any exception. MR. COMYNS CARR: Well, in that case, per-

haps there is no object in going through them in detail so far as they are already exhibited.

THE COMMISSIONER: That is for you to decide.

MR. BROOKS: I was going to object to his going through them. I can't see any use in going through these telegrams since they are already exhibits in evidence.

THE COMMISSIONER: There is no need to discuss it. Mr. Carr does not propose to.

MR. COMYNS CARR: The only other thing I had better do with regard to them in detail is, there are a large number from KUWASHIMA in Tientsin.

Are those included in your answer that you

1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Yes, but let us try and see if we can't. Do I understand you to say that you supplied General MINAMI with copies of all those which you received? Practically all of those telegrams. Q Yes. I don't think I made any exception. You don't think you made any exception. I don't think I made any exception. MR. COMYNS CARR: Well, in that case, perhaps there is no object in going through them in detail so far as they are already exhibited. THE COMMISSIONER: That is for you to decide.

MR. BROOKS: I was going to object to his going through them. I can't see any use in going through these telegrams since they are already exhibits in evidence.

THE COMMISSIONER: There is no need to discuss it. Mr. Carr does not propose to.

MR. COMYNS CARR: The only other thing I had better do with regard to them in detail is, there are a large number from KUWASHIMA in Tientsin.

Are those included in your answer that you

supplied him with copies of those?

A I remember that all these

A I remember that all these telegrams bearing upon the Manchurian Incident, I sent a copy of these telegrams to the Army and the Navy.

Q Yes.

A By the Army I mean including the General Staff.

Q You mean both the War Minister and the General Staff?

A Yes.

Q I see.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Then I may take that as applying to all of them. There is just one name I put to him which he couldn't remember. I had better just show him one of them to remind him that this man was one of the people. Might he lock at exhibit 294?

MR. BROOKS: 2194 didn't you mean?

MR. COMYNS CARR: No, 294 this time.

MR. BROOKS: Well, he is giving the wrong

one.

THE COMMISSIONER: The one just now was 2193, the earlier one.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Yes, but what I am asking

1

...

0

8

9

10

11

13

14 15

16

17

13

19

20

21

23

24

25

for is 294.

MR. BROOKS: And you have given him 2194.

Q (Continuing) That is not the right one, Baron. Hand it back and they will hand you the right one.

Do you notice that that is a telegram from ARAKAWA, Consul General at Yinkow, addressed to -- you needn't trouble to read it, Baron. But, does that remind you that ARAKAWA was the Consul General at Yinkow? It is dated the 13th of November, 1931.

A Yes. He is not the Consul General, of course. He is simply Consul.

Q Consul, I see.

A Yes, but I don't remember exactly whether he was posted at that time in Niuchang.

Q It is the same place as Yinkow?

A Yes.

Q Well, we have telegrams, amongst the exhibits, from him to you under both names but as coming from Yinkow in one case and Niuchang in the other. You say they are the same place?

A Yes.

Q Well, I needn't ask you any more about those. But now, there are certain additional telegrams which I want to ask you about which are not yet exhibits.

1 2

3

5

7 8

9

10

12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

21

22

24

(To Mr. Lynch) Might he have prosecution document 1767A(5), please?

Now, is that a telegram from Consul General HAYASHI addressed to you from Mukden, dated the 21st of September, 1931? You will observe there is a certificate from the Foreign Ministry attached to it showing that it comes from the Foreign Ministry files as one sent to you on that date.

A Oh, yes, yes.

Q Can you, therefore, identify it as one of those you received?

A Yes.

Q And to which your previous answer applied, that there was a copy passed to General MINAMI?

A Yes.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Then I ask that it be admitted in evidence.

THE WITNESS: Our practice is to send all these copies to War Ministry and also --

MR. BROOKS: I object to it, your Honor, as being improper. In the first place, I think it shows Showa 6, 1931. It is outside the scope of this affidavit. It is not even proper cross-examination. It deals with DOHIHARA, and it is an attempt by the prosecution to put in new evidence

1 in this case, not tied up. THE COM ISSIONER: Please don't elaborate be-2 3 cause I do not intend to make final decisions. That is the function of the Tribunal. 5 MR. BROOKS: I see. 6 THE COMMISSIONER: Subject to your objection, 7 the document will be received in evidence and marked 8 with the letter "B." 9 (Whereupon, document 1767A(5) was marked 10 prosecution exhibit "B" for identification.) 11 MR. COMYNS CARR: May it now be marked as an 12 exhibit to the present document? 13 ACTING PRESILENT: It may be so marked. 14 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document No. 15 1767A(5) will receive exhibit No. 3479-B. 16 (Whereupon, the document above re-17 ferred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 18 3479-B, and received in evidence.) 19 Mr. COMYNS CARR: In the ordinary course, your 20 Honor, I would read it into the transcript. 21 THE COMMISSIONER: Very well. 22 MA. COMYNS CARR: Can we dispense with it and 23 have it transcribed?

THE COMMISSIONER: That is convenient.

the defense have no objection, it will be treated as

24

having been read at this stage, and the reporter will be good enough to copy it completely into the transcript.

MR. COMYNS CARA: Thank you.

Showa 6 (1931) 12910 Code Address

Despatched from Mukden on 21 forenoon.

Received: by the Ministry on Sept 21 forenoon.

To; Foreign Minister SHIDEHARA

From: Consul-General HAYASHI

No. 677

1. In view of the present situation in and around the walled city of Mukden, the Commander of the Japanese Army on Sept 20 1931 will place said area under the temporary city administration of Japanese and Chinese acting under the army in order to promote the welfare of both Japanese and Chinese inhabitants.

1. The Nukden city administration area will be limited within the walled city of Nukden and its foreign settlement quarter. The South Manchurian Railway zone will remain as before.

1. The City administration business will be conducted at the Municipal Building which will be set up in the main street of Hsiao Hsi Men in the walled city.

- 1. The city administration business will include all matters concerning Mukden City except for cases otherwise provided for.
 - 1. The officers of the city administration

7 8

1	
1	are as follows:
2	"1. The instructions for other details will
3	be shown separately.
1	"Mayor: Colonel DOHIHARA
5	Mayoral Secretary: TOMIMURA, Junichi
5	Chief of the General Affairs
'	Section: IORIYA, Makoto
3	Chief of the Police Affairs
)	Section: TSURUOKA, Eitaro
	Chief of the Financial Affairs
ı	Section: MITANI, Suejiro
2	Chief of the Sanitary Affairs
3	Section: MORITA, Fukumatsu
1	Ch of the Public Works
5	Section of the Technical
5	Section and of the Enterprise
7	Section: YOSHIKAWA, Yasushi
8	"Besides the above other Japanese or Chinese
9	subjects will be employed to take part in the city
9	administration in accordance with the regulation to
1	be issued separately.
2	"This telegram has been sent to the places
3	mentioned in the previous message."
4	Menteroned in one breatons message.
5	

	33,0
1	BY MR. COMYNS CARR (Continued):
2	Q Now, then, A(6) IPS document 1767A(6).
3	(To the Commissioner) Are they to be
4	numbered now, your Honor?
5	THE COMMISSIONER: I am giving them letters,
6	and the proceedings of the Commission will go in as
7	one of its documents including these exhibits.
8	A Yes, it must be true.
9	Q You see the certificate attached to it?
0	A Yes.
1	Q A telegram from Consul General HAYASHI at
2	Mukden to yourself, dated the 28th of September,
3	1931.
4	A 28th of September, yes.
5	Q And I am not repeating the question every
6	time, whether you passed a copy to General MINAMI,
7	because I am taking your answer as covering all.
8	A Yes.
9	MR. COMYNS CARR: Will that be C?
0	THE COMMISSIONER: That will be received
1	in evidence and marked with the letter "C."
2	MR. BROOKS: I wish to make an objection at
3	the proper time.

THE COMMISSIONER: Subject to the objection

24 25

tendered by the defense.

```
(Whereupon, document 1767A (6)
  1
          was marked prosecution exhibit "C" for
  2
          identification.) (End of reading)
  3
              MR. COMYNS CARR: May it now be marked in
  4
     this proceeding?
 5
             ACTING PRESIDENT: It may be so marked.
 6
             CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document
 7
     No. 1767A(6) will receive exhibit No. 3479-C.
 8
                  (Whereupon, the document above re-
 9
         ferred to was marked prosecution exhibit
 10
         No. 3479-C, and received in evidence.)
 11
             MR. COMYNS CARR (Reading):
 12
              "From Consul General HAYASHI at Mukden to
 13
    Foreign Minister SHIDEHARA
 14
              "Despatched: From Mukden 28 Sept. 1931 PM
. 15
             "Received :
                                 28 Sept. 1931 PM
 16
             "Telegram No. 794 (cipher)
 17
             "According to what DOIHARA told MORIOKA, it is
18
    scheduled that the Local Preservation Committee
19
    organized at this time to maintain peace and order in
20
    the city of Mukden, should be led and gradually made
 21
    into the central organ of administration and a dis-
22
    tinguished Chinese should later be appointed as Mayor,
23
    chosen by this committee. Furthermore, he said that it
24
```

was decided that the self-defence corps now under the

command of our KEMPEITAI should be transferred to the above Peace Preservation Committee and unified under the name of the Peace Maintenance Corps, and it was further decided to have them organize a considerable number of policemen. It is said that to date 1000 rifles were delivered for this purpose.

"Telegrams transmitted to China, Peiping, Nanking, Tientsin and to each consul in Manchuria." BY MR. COMYNS CARR (Continued):

Q Then 1767A(7). Is that a telegram from Consul General HAYASHI to yourself dated the 3rd of October, 1931? Again you will see the certificate and the file.

A Yes, that must be true.

Mi. COMYNS CARR: And that will be D.

THE COMMISSIONER: Prosecution document 1767A(7) will be received in evidence and marked with the letter "D" subject to the reservation and objection by the defense,

(Whereupon, document 1767A(7) was marked prosecution exhibit "D" for identification.) (End of reading)

MR. COMYNS CARR: And I ask that it be marked.

ACTING FRESILENT: It will be so admitted.

-

3

4

5

7

9

11

12

14

15

17

18

20

21

23

24

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document No. 1767A(7) will receive exhibit No. 3479-D.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit
No. 3479-D, and received in evidence.)
MR. COMYNS CARR (Reading):

"From Consul-General HAYASHI at Mukden to Foreign Minister SHIDEHARA

"Dispatched: from Mukden 3 Oct. 1931 P.M. Received: 4 Oct. 1931 P.M.

"Telegram No. 857 (Cipher - Secret)

"There was a rumor on the 3rd among a certain circle of the Japanese residents here that the organization of the Liaoning Autonomous Government with Yuan Chin-Kai as its leader had been decided upon. A message to this effect is said to have been wired to Japan proper.

(1)

This i

2

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

24

25

This is a pure fabrication, and I heard that Yuan, for instance, told a certain influential Japanese that such a nonsensical report was extremely embarrassing/to him/.

"As for the origin of the incorrect telegram mentioned above, I guess that our newspapermen were informed that on the 2nd, yesterday, Col. DOIHARA summoned Ting Chien-Hsiu, a member of the local /Peace/ Preservation Committee and persuaded him to open financial and business offices; that Ting replied that since the matter was of great importance, he would answer one way or the other after thorough deliberation with the leaders, and he retired. They added their own imagination to this, and tying it up with the establishment of a new regime, they spread propaganda about it as if it were an actual fact. Furthermore, in regard to the above-mentioned request by DOIHARA, Yuan Chin-Kai, Ting Chien-Hsiu. and others cannot foresee the future policy of the Japanese Army. It seems that they, hearing of the recent formation in Chinchow of the Liaoning Provincial Government through the instigation of Chang Hsuch Liang, are of the opinion that it is impossible in the present situation for the local Peace Preservation Committee, which is merely an organ, to keep public order in the walled city of lukden, to start such important

administrative organs as financial and business offices. "(RESTRICTED) "Transmitted to China, Peiping, Nanking, Tientsin, and to every consul in Manchuria."

Now, 1767A(8), please. Is that a telegram from Consul General HAYASHI at Mukden to yourself, dated the 6th of October, 1931? A Yes. MR. COMYNS CARR: May that be marked E? Tendered in evidence. THE COLLISSIONER: Subject to the objection of the defense, document 1767A(8) will be received in evidence and marked with the letter "E." 10 (Whereupon, document 1767A(8) 11 was marked prosecution exhibit "E" for identification.) (End of reading) 13 MR. COMYNS CARR: And I ask that it now be received in evidence and marked. 15 ACTING PRESIDENT: It will be received in 16 evidence and marked. 17 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 18 No. 1767A(8) will receive exhibit No. 3479-E. 19 (Whereupon, the document above re-20 ferred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3479-E, and received in evidence.) MR. COMYNS CARR (heading): 23 "From: Consul-General HAYASHI at Mukden 24 To : Foreign Minister SHIDEHARA 25 "Dispatched: Mukden, Oct. 6, 1931, P.M.

1	Q Now, 1767A(8), please. Is that a telegram
2	from Consul General HAYASHI at Mukden to yourself,
3	dated the 6th of October, 1931?
4	A Yes.
5	MR. COMYNS CARR: May that be marked E?
6	Tendered in evidence.
7	THE COLMISSIONER: Subject to the objection
8	of the defense, document 1767A(8) will be received
9	in evidence and marked with the letter "E."
10	(Whereupon, document 17674(8)
11	was marked prosecution exhibit "E" for
12	identification.) (End of reading)
13	MR. COMYNS CARR: And I ask that it now be
14	received in evidence and marked.
15	ACTING PRESIDENT: It will be received in
17	evidence and marked.
18	CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document
19	No. 1767A(8) will receive exhibit No. 3479-E.
20	(Whereupon, the document above re-
21	ferred to was marked prosecution exhibit
22	No. 3479-E, and received in evidence.)
23	MR. COMYNS CARR (Reading):
24	"From: Consul-General HAYASHI at Mukden
25	To : Foreign Minister SHIDEHARA
1	"Dispatched: Mukden, Oct. 6, 1931, P.M.

Received: Oct. 6, 1931, P.M.
"Telegram No. 874 (Cipher, restricted)
Re: My telegram No. 808

"The Four Peoples Preservation Committee, whose president is Kan Chao-Hsi, is an organization whose establishment as a complete religious and charitable organization to extend relief to the poor has been authorized by the municipal office. Lately, with the above Four Peoples Preservation Committee as the basis, YOSHII, Kiyoharu and others, in conspiracy with Kan

Chao-Hsi and others, are planning the establishment of the new political regime and it is a fact that they are trying to negotiate with the army.

"It is said that the military authorities recognized that this maneuver would not only effect a bad influence upon the Local Peace Preservation Committed supported by the army but would also be contrary to their fundamental policies, and on the fifth, Col.

DCIHARA and gendarmerie detachment Commander Mitani admonished Lieut. General Ishimitsu, who came with Yoshii, that it was very unfortunate that he was being taken advantage of by such an adventurer as Yoshii and advised Yoshii to resign voluntarily."

Now, document 1767A(9), please. Is that a 1 telegram from Consul General HAYASHI to yourself 2 dated the 16th of October, 1931? 3 - / Yes, I am sure. 4 MR. COMYNS CARR: May that be received in 5 evidence? THE COMMISSION R: Subject to the objection 7 of the defense, that will be received in evidence, 8 being document 1767A(9), and marked with the letter 9 10 ugu. (Whereupon, document 1767A(9) 11 12 was marked prosecution exhibit "F" for 13 identification.) (End of reading) 14 MR. COMYNS CARR: I ask that it now be received 15 in evidence. 16 ACTING PRESIDENT: Admitted in evidence. .17 CLIRK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 18 No. 1767A(9) will receive exhibit No. 3479F. 19 ("herempon, the document above re-20 ferred to was marked prosecution exhibit 21 No. 3479F and received in evidence.) 22 MR, COMYNS CARR: (Reading) 23 "From: Consul-General HAYASHI at Mukden. 24 Foreign Minister SHIDEHARA "To: 25

"Dispatched: From Mukden, 16 October 1931, PM

"Received:

16 October 1931, PM

"Telegram No. 995 (Cipher)

"Although the Municipal Government office here had been composed, as you know, of Japanese section chiefs under Mayor Col. DOIHARA, in accordance with the stabilization of public neace, preparations are steadily being made under a policy of having the local preservation committee appoint a Chinese Mayor and have Chinese as chiefs of every section as soon as possible. After the above appointements have been decided it is the plan of the army to have every Japanese resign from their present posts and to utilize Japanese experts as advisors in every field. I request that the above be withheld from the press for the time being.

"Transmitted to the Minister, Paiping, Nanking, Tsingtao, Tsinan, Tientsin, Hankow, Canton and each consul in Manchuria."

Then document 1767A(10), please, Is that a telegram from Consul General HATASHI to yourself dated the 19th of October, 1931?

A That is quite right, yes.

THE COMMISSION R: Subject to the same objection by the defense, the prosecution document 1767A(10) will be received in evidence and marked with the letter "G".

```
(Whereupon, document 1767A(10)
1
       was marked prosecution exhibit "G" for
2
        identification.) (Fnd of reading)
3
            MR. COMYNS CARR: I ask that it be received
4
   and marked.
            ACTING PRUSIDENT: It will be admitted.
6
            CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document
7
   No. 1767A(10) will receive exhibit No. 3479G.
8
                  ("hereupon, the document above re-
9
        ferred to was marked prosecution exhibit
10
        No. 3479G and received in evidence.)
11
           MR. COMYNS CARR: (Reading)
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

Duda & Spratt

"From: Consul-General HAYASHI at Mukden

"To: Foreign Minister SHIDERARA

"Dispatched: From Mukden 19 October 1931, P. M.

"Received: 19 October 1931, P. M.

"Tolegram No. 1034 (Cipher)

"Ro: My tologram No. 995

"Chao Hsin-po, though recommended as Mayor of Mukden by the local preservation committee flatly refused to accept that post. However, upon the earnest advice of Col. DOIHARA, he accepted that post on the 18th. Therefore, it has been arranged that within the next two or three days, as soon as the preparations for the taking over of the business of municipal administration are completed Chao will formally assume the post of Mayor, and Mayor DOIHARA and all the Japanese section chiefs will resign from their posts.

"This telegram has been transmitted to China, Peiping, Nanking, Tientsin, Harbin, and Kirin."

Q Document 1767A(17), please. Is that a telegram from Consul General HAYASHI to yourself dated the 27th of October 1931?

A Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: That is tendered, is it?

MR. COMMISSIONER: That is tendered.

THE COMMISSIONER: Subject to the objection by the defense, document 1767A(17) will be received 1 2 in evidence and marked with the letter "H." 3 (Thereupon, document 1767A(17) 4 was marked prosecution exhibit "H" for 5 identification). (End of reading.) MR. COMYNS CARR: And now may it be received 7 in evidence, your Honor? 8 ACTING PRESIDENT: It is now admitted in 9 evidence. 10 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 11 No. 1767A(17) will receive exhibit No. 3479H. 12 ("hereupon, the document above 13 referred to was marked prosecution exhibit 14 No. 3479H and received in evidence.) 15 MR. COMYNS CARR (Reading): 16 "From Consul-General HAYASHI at Mukden 17 "To Foreign Minister SHIDEHARA 18 "MUKDEN, Dispatched. P. M., October 27, 1931. 19 20 "Received: P. M., October 27, 1931. 21 "Telegram No. 1122 (Code, Restricted) 22 "Telegram from me to Tientsin 23 "No. 17 24 "HSIEH-CHIEH-SHIH visited me on 27th and 25 confided in the as follows:

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"By making a cat's paw of LO CHEN-YU, some of the members of the staff of the Kwantung Army attempted at first to draw out Emperor HSUAN TUNG to Manchuria, but this plan did not make much headway owing to the Emperor having backed out as a result of KASHII, Commander of the Japanese Garrison Troops at Tientsin, having advised the Emperor to be prudent. Therefore they, by dispatching a certain UEZUMI (T.N.?), a political free lancer, to Tientsin. later on in order to consult Battalion Commander SAKAI, possessing radical views, had planned to kidnep the Emperor to Tengku, where he was to be put into a cargo-boat and then landed at Yingkow; however, this plan could not be realized due to the strict watch kept by the Japanese police at the Emperor's residence. Consequently, it has been arranged to newly entrust Col. DOIHARA with the aforementioned mission, and the Colonel left here secretly for Tientsin via Dairen with a political free lancer named Takeshi OTANI on the evening of the 26th. (Free lancer Tetsusuburo KUDO might perhaps join this party from Dairen). On arriving at Tientsin they are expected to resort to some suitable measure for executing the plan.

"Furthermore, the other day Staff Officer

4 5

7 8

 MIURA of the Garrison Troops came on a visit here for limison purpose in this matter.

"This wire has been relayed to the Foreign Hinister, Ambassador To China and Peiping."

Q Then 1767A(12), please. (End of reading).

MR. BROOKS: If your Honor please, in copying this into the record on page 35 of the record, if you will refer to the exhibit, they left out the words, "(Copy No. 4-1-205)." I think that we should have this shown in the record when it is recopied again that that does appear at the first part of the telegram. The reason I say that, there is no certificate as to its being a copy of the original or anything of that nature.

IR. COMYNS CARR: I have no objection, if my friend pleases.

IR. BROOKS: IPS document No. 1767A(17), and immediately under that, if you notice, it says, "(Copy No. 4-1-205)," if your Honor please, and that does not appear at page 35 on this copy. It was left out.

MR. COMYNS CARR: There is a certificate attached to it, as your Honor will see if you look at the exhibit at the end of the record, that it is an official document in the custody of the Foreign

4 5

7 8

MIURA of the Garrison Troops came on a visit here for liaison purpose in this matter.

"This wire has been relayed to the Foreign Hinister, Ambassador To China and Peiping."

Q Then 1767A(12), please. (End of reading).

MR. BROOKS: If your Honor please, in copying this into the record on page 35 of the record, if you will refer to the exhibit, they left out the words, "(Copy No. 4-1-205)." I think that we should have this shown in the record when it is recopied again that that does appear at the first part of the telegram. The reason I say that, there is no certificate as to its being a copy of the original or anything of that nature.

MR. COMYNS CARR: I have no objection, if my friend pleases.

MR. BROOKS: IPS document No. 1767A(17), and immediately under that, if you notice, it says, "(Copy No. 4-1-205)," if your Honor please, and that does not appear at page 35 on this copy. It was left out.

MR. COMYNS CARR: There is a certificate attached to it, as your Honor will see if you look at the exhibit at the end of the record, that it is an official document in the custody of the Foreign

Ministry. MR. BROOKS: I do not dispute that, your Honor. I said that there was no certificate that this was a certified, true copy of the original. MR. COMYNS CARR: Continuing to read at the top of page 37 --MR. BROOKS: If the Tribunal please, will that correction be made? There was no ruling. ACTING PRESIDENT: It may be made.

Ministry. MR. BROOKS: I do not dispute that, your Honor. I said that there was no certificate that this was a certified, true copy of the original. MR. COMYNS CARR: Continuing to read at the top of page 37 --MR. BROOKS: If the Tribunal please, will that correction be made? There was no ruling. ACTING PRESIDENT: It may be made.

MR. COMYNS CARR: (Reading)

Then 1767A(12), please. Is that a telegram from Consul General HAYASHI at Mukden to yourself dated November 7, 1931?

A Yes.

MR. COMYNS CARR: I tender that in evidence, your Honor.

THE COMMISSIONER: Subject to the objection of the defense, document 1767A(12) will be received in evidence and marked with the letter "J."

I am stating these as subject to objection. Are they all subject to objection?

MR. BROOKS: Yes, they are, your Honor. THE COMMISSIONER: Very well. Please don't elaborate. We needn't take the time.

(Whereupon, document 1767A(12) was marked prosecution exhibit "J" for identification.)

(End of reading)

MR. COMYNS CARR: And I ask that it be received in evidence and so marked -- be marked as an exhibit now.

ACTING PRESIDENT: It will be admitted in evidence.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document

2

3

4

8

9 10

11 12

13

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

No. 1767A(12) will receive exhibit No. 3479-I.

2

1

3

4

5

6

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22 23

24

25

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3479-I and received in evidence.)

MR. BROOKS: I wish to make the same statement, your Honor, in regard to this document and ask that the words "(Copy No. 4-1-264)" be inserted. It has been left out.

ACTING PRESIDENT: What is the importance of your request, Captain Brooks?

MR. BROOKS: There is no certificate of ' authenticity that this is an authentic, a certified, true copy of the original, and it goes to the weight of the document, the probative value of the document, if something arises on it later. It shows that it is a copy, not the original. I wanted the record to show exactly what the document shows so that later on if it does become important we can raise it at that time. I am not saying that it isn't a true copy; I can't say. Neither can the prosecution.

ACTING PRESIDENT: The record will so show.

MR. COMYNS CARR: I might just say, your Honor, that the witness has testified that there were copies of all these copies made at the time for circulation to the persons he has named; and these two

copies, like the other documents which are the originals, come from the Foreign Office files.

Has it been marked, this one?

CLERK OF THE COURT: Yes.

MR. COMYNS CARR: (Reading)

"From Consul-General HAYASHI at Mukden to Minister SHIDEHARA for Foreign Affairs.

"(No. 4-1-264, Copy)

"Mukden Lispatched a.m. November 7, 1931.

"Received p.m. November 8, 1931.

"Telegraph No. 1221 (Secret Code).

"Referring to outgoing telegram No. 1211.

"As the result of pressure being brought upon Yuan Chin-Kai by the Army Headquarters on the night of the 6th, in the morning of the 7th the Local Peace Preservation Committee held an executives' meeting and decided to add to the decree on acting for the regime the words that it would sever relations with the old regime of Chang Hsueh-liang and the National Government as required by the Army, and this is to be published on the 8th.

"Relayed this wire to China, Peiping and Tientsin."

Q Then document 1767A(11), please. Is that a telegram from Consul General HAYASHI to yourself dated the 28th of October, 1931?

A Yes, that is quite right, yes.

MR. COMYNS CARR: I tender that one, your Honor, but the translation of the last sentence is rather imperfect in English, and I propose to supply a better one. Perhaps, if I might read the last sentence as it should read when better translated, that can go into the record, or if I hand the corrected copy to the court reporter, may it go in in that form?

THE COMMISSIONER: Very well. And, if the defense challenge that translation, perhaps they will be good enough, before the proceedings of the Commission are read, to examine it.

MR. BROOKS: If your Honor please, we have one of the arbiters here. Can he compare it right now and check it?

MR. COMYNS CARR: By all means. Hand the original to the witness, and I will hand my proposed improved translation. You will see it written in pencil on the bottom in place of what is mimeographed in the last sentence.

THE COMMISSIONER: Will you proceed to read

Q Then document 1767A(11), please. Is that a telegram from Consul General HAYASHI to yourself dated the 28th of October, 1931?

A Yes, that is quite right, yes.

MR. COMYNS CARR: I tender that one, your Honor, but the translation of the last sentence is rather imperfect in English, and I propose to supply a better one. Perhaps, if I might read the last sentence as it should read when better translated, that can go into the record, or if I hand the corrected copy to the court reporter, may it go in in that form?

THE COMMISSIONER: Very well. And, if the defense challenge that translation, perhaps they will be good enough, before the proceedings of the Commission are read, to examine it.

MR. BROOKS: If your Honor please, we have one of the arbiters here. Can he compare it right now and check it?

MR. COMYNS CARR: By all means. Hand the original to the witness, and I will hand my proposed improved translation. You will see it written in pencil on the bottom in place of what is mimeographed in the last sentence.

THE COMMISSIONER: Will you proceed to read

.....

what you suggest is the better translation? 1 .T. CO. YNS CART: Well, I have handed my only copy of that to the arbiter. When the lang-3 uage arbiter has had the opportunity of looking at 4 it, he can tell us; and if he approves, then that 5 copy can so into the record. 6 THE CO. ISSION R: Yes. ..eanwhile, so on 7 with your other documents. 8 CO. YNS CARR: ..eanwhile, the letter 9 will be I for that. 10 THE CO. ISSIONE: Yes. Very well. Prose-11 cution document 17674(11), subject to the pojection 12 of the defense, will be received in evidence and 13 14 marked with the letter "I." (..hereupon, foculient 1767A(11) 15 16 was marked prosecution exhibit "I" for 17 identification.) 18 19 20 21 22 24 25

T - Not

(End of reading)

MR. COMYNS CARR: And I ask that the document with the translation as amended by the language arbiter, which appears in the record and was copied into it by the Commissioner's directions, be now received in evidence and marked "I."

ACTING PRESIDENT: It will be received in evidence, but you have already got an "I."

Suppose you get that straightened out during the recess. We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was taken until 1500, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

W 0 f . 2 & L efil

3

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, with regard to the slight confusion in the lettering of those two exhibits, by agreement with Mr. Brooks, we suggest that A-12, which was marked in the Commissioner's report 'J" but has now been marked "I", should be marked "J", as in the Commissioner's report. The marking should be changed, and that A-11, which I am now coming to, should be marked "I". That will not only avoid confusion in the report but will also preserve the continuity of date.

MR. BROOKS: The defense agrees with the prosecutor's remarks, if your Honor please.

ACTING PRESIDENT: That change will be made. CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document No. 1767-A(12) will receive exhibit No. 3479-J, and prosecution document No. 1767-A(11) will receive exhibit No. 3479-I.

(Whereupon, the documents above referred to were marked prosecution exhibit Nos. 3479-J and 3479-I, respectively, and roceived in evidence.)

MR. COMYNS CARR: In this one also, there

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

is an omission in the record, which my friend desires me to mention. In the exhibit, as shown at the end of the record, there appear the words, "Copy No. (blank)".

(Reading Continued)

"From: Consul-General YAHASHI at Mukden
"To: Foreign Minister SHIDEHARA

"Despatched: From Mukden 28 Oct. 1931, P.M. 28 Oct. 1931, P.M. 28 Oct. 1931, P.M.

"Telegram No. 1126-2 (cipher)

"(c) In a prefecture a prefectural Automomy Guidance Committee shall be established under the supervision of the Local Autonomy Guidance office.

It shall guide and supervise the prefectural Autonomy Executive Committee and the Guidance Committee shall be actually occupied by Japanese.

"(d) Furthermore, a policy was decided upon to provide seperately, an autonomy inspection office for the inspection of the prefectural autonomy, and to establish an Autonomy Guidance Members' Training Center for the training of the Autonomy Guidance members. The Autonomy Guidance office is said to be comprised of youth league members in the employee of the South Manchurian Railway.

"(III) On the 28th, the military called together the garrison commanders and the provest marshals of the various areas to support this policy. At this meeting, Chief of the Staff, MIYAKE, gave instructions that this enforcement of the local autonomy and the policy mentioned above shall be

43:

 shall never be revealed outwardly, for we are aiming at the practical effects, as since among the various prefectures, there are many which are steadily succeeding in their administration in enforcing the present autonomy system. Therefore clear instructions were issued that special attention be given to the aforesaid points and every effort made towards the realization of local autonomy in accordance with conditions in each area and subject to what had been recognized as suitable /in each case/.

"Transmitted to China, Peiping, and all the consuls in Manchuria."

(End reading.)

The Tribunal will notice that that is evidently the second part of a telegram, the first part of which is missing. The number is 2 and the beginning in the middle of the lettering.

Continuing the reading at the top of page

(Reading continued.)

43:

absolutely a matter of the internal relations, and shall never be revealed outwardly, for we are aiming at the practical effects, as since among the various prefectures, there are many which are steadily succeeding in their administration in enforcing the present autonomy system. Therefore clear instructions were issued that special attention be given to the aforesaid points and every effort made towards the realization of local autonomy in accordance with conditions in each area and subject to what had been recognized as suitable /in each case/.

"Transmitted to China, Peiping, and all the consuls in Manchuria."

(End reading.)

The Tribunal will notice that that is evidently the second part of a telegram, the first part of which is missing. The number is 2 and the beginning in the middle of the lettering.

Continuing the reading at the top of page

(Reading continued.)

.

Q Now, Baron, was it apparent to you from the various reports you were getting from these consuls that the army in Manchuria -- the Kwantung Army was not, in fact, complying with the directions which you tell us you and General MINAMI had agreed that he should give them?

CROSS

A That is quite true. They were not observing the decisions of the Cabinet.

Q And as that was repeatedly brought to your notice, did you take any further steps to try and get General MINAMI to compel them to do so?

A I have often told MINAMI of what was then happening there in Manchuria, but my impression was that he practically had no power to control these men.

Q Was it no power or no desire?

A I am sure he had every desire to put into force -- put into practice what was discussed and determined at the Cabinet Council, but his idea or his order was not, in fact, obeyed by his subordinates in various parts of Manchuria.

Q Did you ask him why he did not recall those subordinates who wouldn't obey his order?

A There are so many of these subordinate officers there that I was, I remember -- that

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

suggestion was made at the Cabinet Council, but MINAMI, he looked very much embarassed, and I don't think he sent out orders for instructions of that kind to Manchuria. Q Did he say that sending instructions as to

what they were to do would be of no avail?

I am not quite sure what he thought about it, but the fact was plain that his repeated instructions and orders proved of no avail.

Now, the Cabinet could, if they had wished, could they not, have stopped financial supplies to the Kwantung Army?

That had not been discussed at the Cabinet Council.

Q But it was an obvious way of putting a step to it, wasn't it?

I am not quite sure. It was decided in the budget that whatever contained in the budget or these expenses were stated in the budget, and budget, when approved by the then Imperial Piet, the government had to carry it into practice.

Had the budget been approved before this Manchurian Incident broke cut?

> Oh, yes, yes. A

And, therefore, I take it there was no

E. 7

23 24

1

7

8

9 10

12 13

11

14 15

17

18

16

19 20

21 22

23 24 provision in the budget, was there, for the additional expenses caused by this Manchurian Incident?

I don't remember exactly whether we applied for a supplementary budget. That I don't remember. I think, so far as this WAKATSUKI Cabinet was in power, there was no question of supplementary budget being discussed at the Cabinet.

And where did the money come from to provide for the expenses of the Manchurian Incident?

You see, at that time the Tiet was not in session; and without the approval of the Diet wo couldn't spend then any sum of money, but so far as it is contained in the budget we have got to supply the necessary expenses. So far as it is approved -- contained in the budget.

That is to say, you had to supply the War Ministry with the amount of money which had been voted in the budget before the incident broke out.

Even after, you see, even after the incident broke out. The Cabinet collapsed in December, you see, in the early part of December.

0 Yes.

And a few months expenses -- well, I don't know what the War Ministry did, but the War Ministry could find appropriate -- ample means within the

14-44-

2

1

4

6

7 8

9

11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

21

23

24

limits of the budget to find out the means of expenditures.

Q You say that according to your recollection it wasn't necessary for the War Ministry to apply for any further funds beyond what they already had in their budget during that period?

A My impression is that they didn't ask for any.

Q well, let me just try and remind you. Do you remember the troops being moved from Korea without an Imperial order?

A Yes.

Q On the 21st of September or thereabouts.

A Yes.

Q And was there a very hoated discussion in the Cabinet about that proceeding?

A Yes, I remember.

Q Now, before that actually happened, had General MINAMI proposed that reinforcements should be sent from Korea and had the Cabinet refused to agree?

A I don't believe that MINAMI had first proposed that reinforcements be sent from Korea. The report of the reinforcements being sent from Korea came rather as a surprise to all of us.

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

I suggest to you that he had brought up the proposal on two occasions before it happened. A Korea reinforcements, do you mean? Yes. And the Cabinet had refused to agree. I am not quite sure about this monetary -it is what the Finance Minister --Q No, no. I am not asking you at the moment about the money. I am coming back to that in a minute. What I am asking you now is whether he did not on two occasions express a desire in the Cabinet that he should have permission to send troops from Korea into Manchuria, and did not the Cabinet on each occasion refuse that permission? A I am not quite certain about it. Da you remember one occasion? No. You don't remember any occasion at all? Q No, I don't remember any occasion at all. Well, now, then, when he reported on the 22nd of September that, in fact, the troops had been sent from Korea to Manchuria without permission, did

A I don't believe that the question of providing the funds was taken up at the Cabinet Council.

he then ask the Cabinet to provide the necessary

funds, and did the Cabinet agree to do so?

Q I suggest to you that the Cabinet refused to express approval of what had been done but that they did agree to provide the money.

A To you mean that we had to ask for a supplementary budget to cover the expenses?

Q That you agreed in some way or other to provide the additional expense caused by these troops having been sent from Korea.

A I don't know how that could be done. You see, the budget received approval of the Diet, and the Cabinet had no power to modify the budget. If any additional expenditures were needed, what we could do was to apply to the Diet to call for extraordinary session of the Tiet.

Q I am not able to suggest to you how it was done, but I am definitely suggesting to you that the Cabinet agreed to find that money in whatever was the proper procedure. I don't mean before the troops had been sent, but after they had been sent the Cabinet so agreed.

MR. BROOKS: I think, if your Honor please, that question has been asked three or four times and answered. I object to it as being repetitious.

THE COMMISSIONER: Objection overruled.

A Well, I believe that I have already stated

 \mathcal{L}^{\perp}

that after the Incident broke out -- after the reinforcements had been sent from Korea the War Ministry thought that the expenditures could be defrayed within the limits of the budget, and they, as I remember, didn't apply for any additional expenditure.

Q Did War Minister MINAMI, if that is correct, apply for the approval of the Cabinet to his appropriating part of his original budget to pay for this expenditure?

A No, I don't remember that he did so. It was not necessary. So far as it was already approved by the Diet, there is no need for him to go to the Cabinet to ask for additional expenditures so far as these expenditures could be covered within the limits of the budget.

Q Now, was it within the power of General MINAMI to apply or refuse to apply part of the money already voted in the budget for the War Ministry to expenses in Manchuria?

A I remember that so far as the WAKATSUKI Cabinet was in power, the expenditures needed were not such a large amount.

Q That may be, but what I am suggesting to you is this. If no additional money was wanted

beyond what had already been voted, then it was within the power of General MINAMI to say no part of what has been voted shall be applied to expenses incurred contrary to orders in this Manchurian Incident. Isn't that so?

A The fact is that he had not asked permission or he had not brought up that question before the Cabinet Council, so I don't know how that question was dealt with there.

Q I am suggesting to you that it was obvious that if he was really sincere in wanting to stop this, he had complete power to do it in one of two ways, either by refusing to find the money out of his budget or by recalling those officers who were not carrying out his instructions, and that he did neither. Isn't that right?

A That is right. That is legally right. But, if that would be -- you see, within his practical power to do that. You see, there might be quite revolution among these army men, and he would be placed in a very impossible position. Perhaps he thought about it and he didn't press that question at the Cabinet Council.

Q Then is your explanation of his having done nothing effective to stop it that he was afraid of

a revolution?

2

1

3

5

7 8

9

10

11

13 14

15

17

18

20

21 22

23

24

A Revolution might be, perhaps, a strong term, but there might be wholesale indiscipline, and the men there in Manchuria, without any money, how could they live? You see, MINAMI had to look at the question from that practical side, I thought.

G Then are you telling us that it was considered better that a war should be carried on in Manchuria contrary, as you say, to your orders than that the troops in Manchuria should be left without money to live?

A But they had already given assurance that there would be no aggravation of war, and all that we did was put that declaration into effect with possibly less friction.

Q Now I'll ask you about another matter.

Consul HAYASHI from the very beginning had been making reports extremely adverse with regard to the conduct of the military in Manchuria, had he not?

A Yes, he was supposed to.

Q And you tell us that you passed on those reports to General MINAMI and to the General Staff?

A Yes.

Q Now, did you know, as was proved by the defense yesterday, that on the 20th of September,

a revolution?

A Revolution might be, perhaps, a strong term, but there might be wholesale indiscipline, and the men there in Manchuria, without any money, how could they live? You see, MINAMI had to look at the question from that practical side, I thought.

Q Then are you telling us that it was considered better that a war should be carried on in Manchuria contrary, as you say, to your orders than that the troops in Manchuria should be left without money to live?

A But they had already given assurance that there would be no aggravation of war, and all that we did was put that declaration into effect with possibly less friction.

Q Now I'll ask you about another matter.

Consul HAYASHI from the very beginning had been making reports extremely adverse with regard to the conduct of the military in Manchuria, had he not?

A Yes, he was supposed to.

Q And you tell us that you passed on those reports to General MINAMI and to the General Staff?

A Yes.

Q Now, did you know, as was proved by the defense yesterday, that on the 20th of September,

1

6 7

9 10

11 12

13 14

15 16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23 24

25

1931, the Vice-Chief of the General Staff sent a telegram to the Chief of Staff of the Kwantung Army, exhibit 3422-B, paragraph , in the following terms: "As some officials in the Japanese diplomatic and South Manchurian Railway circles in Manchuria are suspected of sending groundless reports about actions of the Army, please endeavor to investigate their sources and seriously provide all means to eliminate such unpatriotic acts. I believe that the Army should make a declaration of its grave resolution in case unpatriotic schemes are still continued."?

Did you know that was what the General Staff in Tokyo was telegraphing to Mukden about your Consul General there?

Well, was that a telegram from the General Staff?

General Staff in Tokyo to the Chief of Staff in Mukden.

In Mukden.

Q Or in Manchuria, wherever he was.

Well, they haven't sent me a copy of that telegram. I have no knowledge whatever.

Well, let's just carry that a little further. Was there a man named MORISHIMA who was the head of the Asiatic Bureau in your ministry?

Q That is a different man from the MORISHIMA who was assistant consul in Mukden.

A Yes.

A Yes.

Q Now, did that MORISHIMA go, I suppose on your order, to Mukden to investigate matters at first hand?

A That he should go to Mukden to investigate the incident?

Q Yes, or did you send him to Mukden for any purpose in September, 1931?

A I don't think I did. There was the Consul General there, HAYASHI, and I don't think there was any additional -- any special reason for sending another man from Tokyo.

Q What I am suggesting is that MORISHIMA was sent from Tokyo, the Section Chief of the Asia Bureau, to see HAYASHI and find out for himself what was happening there.

A Well, that is not impossible.

Q Let me try and refresh you with what I am going to suggest he reported when he came back. Did he say that he had said to HAYASHI, "The Cabinet does not want this incident to enlarge. Therefore, I want you to bear that in mind in handling all matters"?

And did he say that Consul General HAYASHI had replied, "That is practically impossible"?

A Well, what date was that?

Q At some time before the 2nd of October, 1931. That is to say, in the last week of September or just at the beginning of October.

A No, I don't remember.

Q Did he say that the situation in Manchuria was such that the incident had only a tendency to expand further?

A No, I don't remember whether he reported that to me.

Q Did he say that even the life of Consul General HAYASHI was in danger?

A Possibly, but I don't remember.

Q Well, now, you've heard what the General Staff were telegraphing about HAYASHI to the Chief of Staff in Manchuria. Wouldn't be surprising if HAYASHI's life was in danger, would it?

A Probably so. His life may be in danger. But everybody's life was in danger, including myself. My own life was in danger.

Q Yes, I realize that. Did MORISHIMA report that the militarists in Manchuria considered HAYASHI an obstacle and there was an indication of an at-

1

3

5

6

0

9

10

12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

tempted assassination?

A I don't know if there was any attempt at assassination of HAYASHI.

Q Now, I am coming now to something which I think may help you to remember this report of MORISHIMA's. Did MORISHIMA report to you that the condition there was such that even the commander in chief of the Kwantung Army was in a state of restriction to quarters?

A I heard that, yes.

Q Yes. I thought you had heard that. And did you not hear it from MORISHIMA? I am reminding you now. Don't you think it was from MORISHIMA that you heard it?

MORISHIMA, but I heard that from somewhere, and it was an open secret at that time. Nobody could approach the commander in chief, the commander of the Kwantung Army himself. If anybody should go there and apply for interview with him, the subordinate officers would come and say no, you shouldn't approach direct to the commander.

Q Did MORISHIMA report that three staff officers of the Kwantung Army, ISHIHARA, HANATANI and ITAGAKI, were the center of activity in Man-

1 2

,

churia; and, since the Chief of Staff of the Kwantung Army, MIYAKE, was not at all able to control his staff, the three were left to do things as they pleased?

A I don't remember that MORISHIMA reported that to me.

Q Did he report that when these three officers drank together they always boasted that this plot was planned lcng ago?

A No, I don't think I --

Q Well, if he had so reported, it would have agreed with the information that you had from the businessmen from Manchuria, wouldn't it?

A It would. But I don't remember --

Q You don't remember hearing that from MORISHIMA. Did he say that these men said that on the 25th of July an artillery battery was already ready in Mukden?

A 25th of July?

Q Yes.

A Next year?

Q Perhaps you haven't understood. What I am suggesting is that these three men, according to MORISHIMA, were saying that an artillery battery was made ready in Mukden as early as the 25th of July.

8

1

2

3

5

6

7

10 11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

21

22

24

No, I hadn't heard of that. It was ready,

2 3

1

5 6

7

8

9 10

11 12

13 14

15 16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24

you said. Was made ready, yes, on the 25th of July.

Had not MORISHIMA previously reported in August that the Army was attempting to use the killing of Captain NAKAMURA in Mongolia as a tool for the solution of the Manchuria-Mongolian matter by enlarging its importance?

MR. BROCKS: If your Honor please, I have been listening right along, and I want to object. This is all outside of this affidavit. To save time I wish I could enter a continuing objection.

THE COMMISSIONER: I cannot take it in that general way. I was prepared to accept it. In regard to the objection that this particular question is outside the scope of the affidavit, the objection is overruled and may be renewed before the Tribunal.

Do you remember MORISHIMA so reporting on or about the 23rd of August 1931?

It is difficult to remember all these particulars.

0 Yes.

A It is years, years ago.

Now, I will leave that matter, and I want

to ask you about the subject matter of the telegrams from KUWASHIMA and others, about the escape of Pu-Yi from Tientsin at the end of October and November and his ultimate arrival in Manchuria.

MR. BROOKS: I object to that, your Honor, as not arising out of the affidavit and also being repetitious. There is an affidevit by the prosecution.

THE COMMISSIONER: The objection will be noted and may be resumed before the Tribunal.

Did MINAMI take the view on that point that it was a good -- it would be a good thing in due course to have, at the proper time, an independent Manchuria established under Pu-Yi but that it was premature at the date in question, namely October and November, 1931?

MR. BROOKS: Objection to that question.

A I can't --

MR. BROOKS: It is repetitious.

(Continuing) I can't tell what MINAMI had in mind with that question. I hadn't discussed with him on that phase of the matter.

Q Did you take the same view -- that view yourself?

> It was not only premature, it was alto-A

3

1

2

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

gether wrong, it seems to me, that course of action.
(End of reading)

Now, may it please the Tribunal, I am prepared to omit, subject to my friend's agreement, from there to near the bottom of page 63 on this ground; that the questions included there were based on exhibit 286 and the witness pointed out errors in the translation of that exhibit. It was ultimately agreed to refer it to the Language Arbitration Board who have reported just before this report of this commission was read certain corrections in that translation. Therefore it seems to be a waste of the time of the Tribunal to read a part of the cross-examination which turns out to have been based on an erroneous translation.

4 5

gether wrong, it seems to me, that course of action. (End of reading)

Now, may it please the Tribunal, I am prepared to omit, subject to my friend's agreement, from there to near the bottom of page 63 on this ground; that the questions included there were based on exhibit 286 and the witness pointed out errors in the translation of that exhibit. It was ultimately agreed to refer it to the Language Arbitration Board who have reported just before this report of this commission was read certain corrections in that translation. Therefore it seems to be a waste of the time of the Tribunal to read a part of the cross-examination which turns out to have been based on an erroneous translation.

Kapleau & Knapp

1

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

MR. BROOKS: If the Tribunal please, I cannot agree with the prosecutor. I state that it should be read. There are two or three points in there that are explained that are beneficial to the defense. Also, I wish to state that the correction made by the Language Arbitration Board was only on exhibit 286, and did not appear in the record of the proceedings of the 19th of November. I asked at the time that it be transcribed as if it had been read but it was through error or oversight that it was not done. However, I would like to ask that the Language Arbitration Board correct court record page 4356 to 4358 in accordance with their correction of exhibit 286 made yesterday, 19 November, and that it be spread upon the record when they do make that correction. They may be able to do it now. I called this to the attention of the Language Arbitration Board previously and they may be prepared to do that. I am not certain, your Honor, However, it can be done the first thing in the morning rather than interrupt it at this time. I do suggest that this be read.

20

21

ACTING PR SIDENT: If there are any corrections, they should be made.

22

What is it that you agree on now should not be

24

read?

MR. BROOKs: I would say, your Honor, that

since this is in evidence, I would read this myself if the prosecution does not intend to do so.

MR. COMVNS CARR: Well, your Honor, it is difficult to understand, but if my friend says that, I had better read it.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Proceed.

MR. COMVNS CARR: (Reading continued) Night the witness see exhibit 286?

Q Is that your telegram sent by you to KUWASHIMA in Tientsin on the 1st of November, 1931? I will be directing your attention to parts of it soon. If you will, just look at it and see if that is your telegram or a copy thereof.

A Yes, this is my telegram to Tientsin, to KUWASHIMA.

Q Yes, KUWASHIMA.

A November the 1st.

O Yes.

A It says, to make Pu-Yi as the Emperor was entirely out of question. It is an anachronism, it says.

Q Well, now, let us just see. What I am suggesting is that you were instructing him that this was not the right time to make Pu-Yi the Emperor but that it would be a very good thing to do later on.

3

1

5

6

7 8

10

11

13

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

21

23

24

No, no. This telegram doesn't signify that. Well, let me read to you just one or two passages of it. In the paragraph numbered 2, first of all you say, "However, to form an independent

Quite so.

state in Manchuria at this time would immediately raise the question as being contrary to Section 1, article 1 of the Washington Nine Power Pact," and so on. Then a little lower down you find a portion in brackets: "Even if we make it in the form of a voluntary escape of the amperor, the other Powers are not likely to believe this, and it is extremely difficult to keep incidents of this kind in secret."

"In any case, the abduction of the Emperor at this time would bring us into the most unfavorable situation in face of the session of the Board of Directors on 16 November and world opinion will again be incensed and our scheme to carry out gradually our actual construction work in that locality later with the pacification of world opinion would be greatly handicapped."

A No, it doesn't say anything about that. The latter part, as you said.

Honor, to the language section, that exhibit 286.
We've seen it. There are three mistakes in their translation. It seems to be a distorted translation, also in paragraph 4.

THE COMMISSIONEY: This is rather late to

be doing it. But that is not a function of this Commission at any event. That is a function of the Court. You must make your application to the Court.

CROSS

THE VITNESS: I am afraid what you read was not the right translation of the original.

THE COMMISSIONER: Would you be good enough to translate that portion yourself, Baron SHIDEMARA? That might help us.

THE WITNESS: The abduction of the Emperor Pu-Yi would prove a great obstacle to our constructive work to find out the solution of the question. Something of that kind.

Q Do you say that the words "at this time" do not appear?

Oh, yes.

They do.

Yes. But that doesn't mean that later on that might become a good thing.

ATT. COMYNS CARR: Well, your Honor, I think I will not pursue this matter further with the witness at this stage. The document, whatever the correct translation of it may be, speaks for itself, and I will take steps to have it referred to the language arbitration board.

3 4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

6...

THE WITNESS: But you should make just one word more. THE COMMISSIONER: Just a moment, please. You want to say something, Baron SHIDEHARA? THE WITNESS: Yes. In any case, if you read the No. 3, it says, in any case, such a scheme

simply an anachronism to bring Pu-Yi to manchuria as the Emperor. Anachronism. Isn't a word of that kind used?

THE COMMISSIONER: Well, it does occur. "Quite erroneous of time" is the translation. I don't think I will make any suggestion.

MR. T. OKAMOTO: There are a great deal of mistakes.

AR. COMYNS CARR: Until it has been verified. It is, perhaps, unfortunate that, if the defense had any objection to this translation, they hadn't raised it before. But it had better be referred.

THE COMMISSIONER: If it is agreed on both sides, then I will ask Mr. Saño to take in hand the revision of the translation of exhibit 286.

ER. COMYNS CARR: Thank you, yes.

LR. BROOKS: The whole of it.

LR. COMYNS CARR: The whole of it, yes, by all means. That concludes my cross-examination.

10

9

11 12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

23

24

1	LANGUAGE ARBITER (Mr. Sano): I recommend
2	the adoption of the revised translation of IPS in
3	lieu of the last four lines of exhibit I.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: As offered here?
5	LANGUAGI ARBITER (Ar. Sano): Yes, as
6	offered there.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, that is in effect
8	then.
9	M.R. COMYNS CARR: You approve of the revised
10	translation which we suggested ourselves?
11	LANGUAGE ARBITER (Mr. Sano): Yes.
12	mR. COLYNS CARR: Then will it be copied
13	into the record in that form?
14	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, if Mr. Greenberg
15	will do so.
16	MR. COMYNS CATT: And when we serve it, it
17	will be in the revised form.
18	BY MR. COMYNS CARR (Continued):
19	Baron SHIDEHARA, there is one other matter
20	I should ask you about. Do you remember a Cabinet
21	meeting on the 1st of October
22	THE COLLISSIONER: Of what year?
23	AR. COLYNS CARR: 1931.
24	Q (Continuing) in which you asked for a
25	clarification of the policy of the Japanese in Man-

1 churia befor

churia before the opening of the neeting of the League of Nations Council to be held in Geneva on the 14th of that month?

A I think I did.

Yes. And did you suggest that the maintenance of more than necessary troops in manchuria, and particularly in Kirin and Tungkai, would be harmful to the views that foreign powers would take at that meeting?

A Kirin --

right. We'll take the Kirin and leave out the other one.

A Dairen we call it. Dairen is the same thing. But some other port you mentioned.

ç Yes. I have it spelled here: T-u-n-g-k-a-i, Tungkai.

A Tungkao?

Don't trouble about the place names. Did you raise generally the question in the Cabinet of excessive troops being stationed in manchuria on that occasion?

A Yes, quite possible. Tungkao means Tientsin.

Q Well, whatever it means, you raised that question. Did MINAMI propose that Japan should there

4 5

6

7

8

3

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

and then withdraw from the League of Nations?

A No.

Did he say, "If we withdraw troops now, the situation will be very difficult for us, and we will not be able to maintain control of the situation in mukden and Kirin. In the first place, I believe it is better for Japan to withdraw from the League of Nations"?

A No, that question had never been raised.

I am quite sure of it.

You said the question of withdrawing from the League of Nations was not discussed in the Cabinet at all.

sion at all. We were actively collaborating with the League of Nations at Geneva, and we supplied all the necessary information, and our delegates participated in the debates and discussions all the time.

And there was no occasion for MINAMI to say that we should withdraw from the League of Nations.

and not suggesting that the rest of the Cabinet agreed with it -- MINALI advocated that instead of trying to do what the League of Nations wanted, you should withdraw from the League of Nations.

A I am almost sure -- I can say I am sure that

INAMI had not raised that question.

MR. COMYNS CARR: That is all I have.

THE COLD ISSIONER: Do you wish to reexamine?

(End of reading.)

HR. COLYNS CARR: And then Mr. Brooks re-

HR. COLYNS CARR: And then Hr. Brooks reexamined.

MR. BROOKS: (Reading continued:)

MR. BROOKS: I have a question or two.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BROOKS:

o In the last part of your affidavit, Mr. SHIDEPARA, you said there was an unfounded story as to one purporting that you had come to loggerheads with War Minister MINAMI on account of maintenance of opposite ideas at meetings of the Cabinet. Now, I take it by that that you mean that you --

IR. COMYNS CARR: I must object to that question as being leading.

IR. BROCKS: I haven't finished the question.

ready before you finish it.

THE COLLISSIONER: You may not say what you consider. You can only ask the witness to elaborate what requires elaboration.

10

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

> 19 20

> 21

22

24

24

MR. BROOKS: I withdraw the question and ask this one: (Continuing) Were you and MINAMI having opposite ideas at the meetings of the Cabinet? Not on very important questions, no. 5 Were you having such ideas that would have 6 led to friction between you? No. A 8 Now, in answer to one of the prosecutor's questions, you said that something might be a legal 10 point but that practically NINAMI had no choice in the 11 matter. Do you recall what you were discussing? 12 13 A Yes. O Under the same circumstances, Baron SHIDEHARA, 14 would you, yourself, and the Cabinet have supported 15 16 MINAMI's decision in that matter, or did you support 17 his decision in that matter? (End of reading.) 18 MR. BROOKs: Here I refer the Tribunal to 19 page 1334 of the record, line 22, where the witness 20 SHIDEHARA said that he agreed with MINAMI's ideas on 21 previous testimony. 22 (Reading continued:)

THE COMMISSIONER: What matter is it, because

I am at a loss to understand what you mean?

THE COMMINE CARR: I don't know what -THE COMMISSIONER: What particular decision
are you referring to, Mr. Brooks?

MR. BROOKE: The question of the prosecutor.

I don't know how to put it myself.

Q Do you understand what I am talking about to you?

I don't understand it exactly.

Q The supply of money.

1	A oh, the supply of money.
2	Q And you said that this supply of money
3	this was a legal point and there was a practical
4	point. Now can you answer my question?
5	A Yes.
6	o Did you and the cabinet approve of the
.7	action that MINAMI actually took under the circum-
8	stances?
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Approve of what action?
10	MR. BROOKS: Of any action of making a
11	decision of that nature at that time.
12	MR. COMYNS CARR: I am afraid the question
13	isn't cloar to me if I had to answer it.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: I just do not understand
15	the question. Making what decision or what action?
16	MR. BROOKS: Was there any decision made?
17	THE COMMISSIONER: About what?
18	A The decision was that we should try to do
9	our best to localize the incident, not to bring about
20	aggrandizement of the situation.
21	O Would you say that MINAMI did his best to
22	support the Cabinet in doing bringing about the
23	localizing of the incident?

A His intention was, certainly, to localize

the incident to prevent aggravation of the incident.

25

3

4

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

Q Would you say that MINAMI had it in his power to have prevented the further expansion of the incident?

A He had, I believe, a legal power, yes.

o "hat do you mean by that 'legal power'?

A Well, it is under the law -- existing law
he could send any order to his subordinates, but he
probably looked at the question from a broader point
of view: whether that would bring any deterioration
of the whole situation in Manchuria. (End of reading)

I want to refer the Tribunal to pages 19,916 and 19,917 on this point as to what MINAMI said, and also I want the Tribunal to compare what the witness SHIDEHARA said here with what he said at record page 1338, line 16, and page 1392, line 17; also to record page 19,916 and 19,917, and 20,054 and 20,058.

(Reading continued:)

O Do you mean that MINAMI, as "ar Minister, could send an operational order to officers in the field?

A Operational order?

Onder. Do you know the difference between an operation order and an administrative order?

A No, he couldn't send an operational order.
Operational order should be sent through the Chief

18

17

19

21

23

24

2

3

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

of the General Staff.

was the Chief of the General Staff a sub-Ordinate of the "ar Minister?

A No. no.

o "Was he a higher authority or of equal rank?

Well, it is difficult to say, but equal,

7 I should say. (End of reading)

I would like to refer the Tribunal here to page 1396 to 1398, the re-cross-examination of SHIDE-HARA, to show his lack of knowledge as to who was responsible for the action of the army and as to the High Command's functions being independent of the War Minister, as proven by other evidence offered by both the prosecution and the defense.

(Reading continued:)

THE COMMISSIONER: Any further questions,

Mr. Brooks?

MR. BROOKS: I think that's all.

THE COMMISSIONER: Very well. I will ask Mr. Greenberg to prepare a transcription of the proceedings, and upon that being done I will report to the Tribunal.

(Whereupon, at 1530, the proceedings were concluded.) (End'cf reading)

23

24

,

MR. BROOKS: Now, if the Tribunal please, at this time I wish to refer to the counts of the Indictment in which MINAMI is not named.

ACTING PRESIDENT: I don't see how that is material at this time, Captain Brooks.

MR. BROOKS: I have not concluded, your Honor, the presentation of MINAMI's case. "e only postponed it for this.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Nevertheless, in my submission this is a matter for summation and not to be dealt with here today.

ACTING PRESIDENT: You can refer us to certain pages of the transcript or something of that kind, but so far as the various counts of the Indictment are concerned, that is material at this time. It is a question for summation.

MR. BROOKS: I am making this reference to the counts in which MINAMI is not charged in the Indictment for the reason that I am not offering evidence on these counts, although the prosecution in certain instances has made references to evidence in matters in which the accused has not been charged, and I think --

ACTING PRESIDENT: That is a matter for argument in your summation.

this time I wish to refer to the counts of the Indictment in which MINAMI is not named.

ACTING PRESIDENT: I don't see how that is

MR. BROOKS: Now, if the Tribunal please, at

material at this time, Captain Brooks.

MR. BROOKS: I have not concluded, your

Honor, the presentation of MINAMI's case. "e only postponed it for this.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Nevertheless, in my submission this is a matter for summation and not to be dealt with here today.

ACTING PRESIDENT: You can refer us to certain pages of the transcript or something of that kind, but so far as the various counts of the Indictment are concerned, that is material at this time. It is a question for summation.

MR. BROOKS: I am making this reference to the counts in which MINAMI is not charged in the Indictment for the reason that I am not offering evidence on these counts, although the prosecution in certain instances has made references to evidence in matters in which the accused has not been charged, and I think --

ACTING PRESIDENT: That is a matter for argument in your summation.

独

MR. BROOKS: I thought that by presuming the charges in which he is not named it would be apparent, when the Court reaches the end of my evidence, why I have not brought up certain matters in rebuttal.

6

7

5

ACTING PRESIDENT: One of my colleagues makes a very pertinent remark in that connection: that if he is not charged under any count of the Indictment, the Tribunal cannot find him guilty of it.

10

11

12

MR. BROOKS: I agree with that in the ordinary circumstances, but in an Indictment with the sweeping charges that are made in certain counts it might be taken that by not answering on certain matters I was going to refer to I am admitting or not refuting those matters. I don't press it, however.

15 16

14

ACTING PRESIDENT: Well, the Court doesn't want to hear it.

18 19

20

21

17

MR. BROOKS: I wish to refer to a question on cross-examination at page 1378, line 21, which was taken from Appendix A, Section 1, of the Indictment, and submit that the prosecution does not charge the WAKATSUKI Cabinet members -- government with acts of aggression in Manchuria.

22 23

> ACTING PRESIDENT: We don't want any argument on that, Mr. Carr.

25

MR. BROOKS: I thought that by presuming the charges in which he is not named it would be apparent, when the Court reaches the end of my evidence, why I have not brought up certain matters in rebuttal.

ACTING PRESIDENT: One of my colleagues makes a very pertinent remark in that connection: that if he is not charged under any count of the Indictment, the Tribunal cannot find him guilty of it.

MR. BROOKS: I agree with that in the ordinary circumstances, but in an Indictment with the sweeping charges that are made in certain counts it might be taken that by not answering on certain matters I was going to refer to I am admitting or not refuting those matters. I don't press it, however.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Well, the Court doesn't want to hear it.

MR. BROOKS: I wish to refer to a question on cross-examination at page 1378, line 21, which was taken from Appendix A, Section 1, of the Indictment, and submit that the prosecution does not charge the WAKATSUKI Cabinet members -- government with acts of aggression in Manchuria.

ACTING PRESIDENT: We don't want any argument on that, Mr. Carr.

MR. BROOKS: Does the Court hold it is argumentative?

ACTING PRESIDENT: Yes.

MR. BROOKS: Then, I will close MINAMI's case at this time, subject to the production of certain evidence in rebuttal of new evidence that has been received here if my co-counsel, who is sick, finds it necessary to do so.

ACTING PRESIDENT: You may present an application for that at the proper time.

Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER: If it please the Tribunal, with regard to the ISHII affidavit in the MUTO phase, I am now informed that although cross-examination could be conducted during the first of the week by dividing time between a morning and an afternoon session, the witness is prepared for a serious operation on Tuesday or later. We have reconsidered the entire matter and under all the circumstances the prosecution does not desire to insist on its right to cross-examine or take further testimony by means of interrogations or interrogatories. In this situation it is suggested that MUTO's phase be completed by the reading of the affidavit at an early time. It is obviously too late to begin this evening.

ACTING PRESIDENT: If it is agreeable to coun-1 sel for the accused MUTO, we will take it up the first thing in the morning. Is there anything further to be submitted in the way of translation? If so, I will ask they be 5 ready the first thing in the morning. MR. BROOKS: 286 might be presented in the 7 8 morning. ACTING PRESIDENT: We will have that in the 9 10 morning. We will adjourn until 9:30 tomorrow morning. 11 12 (Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment 13 was taken until Friday, 21 November 1947, at 14 0930.) 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25